arXiv:math/0505482v2 [math.AG] 25 May 2005

A Compactification of the Space of Holomorphic Maps from $\mathbb{P}^1$ into $\mathbb{P}^r$

Jiayuan Lin

Abstract Let $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r)$ be the space of $(r+1)$-tuples $(f_0, \cdots, f_r)$ modulo homothety, where $f_0, \cdots, f_r$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree d in two variables. Let $M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ be the open subset of $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r)$ such that $f_0, \cdots, f_r$ have no common zeros. Then $M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ parametrizes the space of holomorphic maps of degree d from $\mathbb{P}^1$ into $\mathbb{P}^r$. In general the boundary divisor $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ is not normal crossing. In this paper we will give a natural stratification of this boundary and show that we can process an iterated blow-ups along these strata (or its proper transformations) to obtain a compactification of $M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^n)$ with normal crossing divisors.

1 Introduction

Let $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) = \mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ be the space of $(r+1)$-tuples $(f_0, \cdots, f_r)$ modulo homothety, where $f_0, \cdots, f_r$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree d in two variables. Let $M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ be the open subset of $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r)$ such that $f_0, \cdots, f_r$ have no common zeros. Then $M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ parametrizes the space of holomorphic maps of degree d from $\mathbb{P}^1$ into $\mathbb{P}^r$. In general the boundary divisor $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ is not normal crossing, so $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r)$ is not a good compactification of the open variety $M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$. In this paper we will give a natural stratification of $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ and show that an iterated blow-ups along these strata (or its proper transformations) can be carried out to obtain a compactification of $M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^n)$ with normal crossing divisors.

The existence of compactifications of an open variety by adding normal crossing divisors is guaranteed by Hironaka's Theorem on resolution of singularities. However, in practice, for certain open varieties people like to construct such compactifications explicitly. Take, for example, the famous work by W. Fulton and R. Macpherson [1] on configuration spaces, and its further extensions by R. Macpherson and C. Procesi [6] and Ulyanov [7]. Recently Y. Hu [4] generalized the above results. For any given open variety meeting certain conditions, he proved that a compactification with normal crossing divisors can be obtained by blowing up along an arrangement of its subvarieties. As one of applications of his theorem, in the introduction and section 6 of [4], Y. Hu proposed the following

Theorem 1.1. *A compactification of $M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ with normal crossing divisors can be obtained by iterated blow-ups along the strata (or its proper transformations) of $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$.*

S. Keel observed that some problem might arise in the iterated blow-ups. The lowest stratum is smooth, along which the blow-up can be carried out. However, starting from the second one, each stratum has singularities along the lower strata. So the second blow-up can be done only if one can show that the singularities of the second stratum have

been resolved after the first blow-up. Similarly in order to carry out the k-th ($2 \leq k \leq d$) blow-up, one has to show that the singularities of the k-th stratum are resolved after the first $(k-1)$ blow-ups. In this paper we will confirm that it is the case. As a consequence, Theorem 1.1 holds.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is a preliminary, in which we will describe a natural stratification of $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ and its related properties. In section 3, we will first set up some notations, and then give a proof of Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Professor Y. Hu for his interest in and comments on this work. I am also grateful to Professor J. M^{c}Kernan and Professor V. Alexeev for helpful discussions and suggestions.

2 preliminary

Let $f_i(x,y) = \sum_{j=0}^{d} s_{ij} x^{d-j} y^j (i = 0, 1, \cdots, r)$ be $r+1$ homogeneous polynomials of degree d in two variables x and y. Let R_k be the subset in $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r)$ which parametrizes $f_0, \cdots, f_r$ with at least $d-k+1$ common roots (counting multiplicities). Then $R_1 \subset R_2 \subset \cdots \subset R_d = M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ gives a natural stratification of $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$.

Let $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ be the following matrix:

$$A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{00} & s_{01} & \cdots & s_{0d} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ s_{10} & s_{11} & \cdots & s_{1d} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ s_{r0} & s_{r1} & \cdots & s_{rd} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & s_{00} & s_{01} & \cdots & s_{0d} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & s_{10} & s_{11} & \cdots & s_{1d} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ 0 & s_{r0} & s_{r1} & \cdots & s_{rd} & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & s_{00} & s_{01} & \cdots & s_{0d} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & s_{10} & s_{11} & \cdots & s_{1d} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & s_{r0} & s_{r1} & \cdots & s_{rd} \end{pmatrix}_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} \tag{2.1}$$

Then the following lemmas are true.

Lemma 2.1. *The polynomials $f_0, \cdots, f_r$ have at least $d-k+1$ common roots (counting multiplicities) in $\mathbb{P}^1$ if and only if the matrix $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ has rank less than $2k$.*

Proof. See proposition 3 in [5]. □

Lemma 2.2. *R_k has dimension $d+kr$*

Proof. R_k parametrizes all the tuples $(f_0, \cdots, f_r)$, or equivalently, points $[s_{00} : \cdots : s_{0d} : \cdots : s_{r0} : \cdots : s_{0d}]$ in $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$, such that $f_i(x,y) = \sum_{j=0}^{d} s_{ij}x^j y^{d-j}$ $(i = 0, 1, \cdots, r)$ have at least $d-k+1$ common roots (counting multiplicities). So, to compute its dimension, it is enough to compute the dimension of the intersection of R_k and the affine open sets $s_{i0} \neq 0$ $(i = 0, 1, \cdots, r)$. For each i, $s_{i0}^{-1} f_i(x,y)$ can be expressed as a product of linear factors $x + \alpha_{ij}y (j = 1, \cdots, d)$. Hence we have $(r+1)$ ways to choose s_{i0} $(i = 0, \cdots, r)$, $(d-k+1)$ ways to choose the common roots (counting multiplicities), and $(k-1)$ ways to choose the rest linear factors appearing in each $s_{i0}^{-1} f_i(x,y)$ for $i = 0, 1, \cdots, r$. Therefore the dimension of the intersection of R_k and the affine open sets $s_{i0} \neq 0$ $(i = 0, \cdots, r)$ is $(r+1) + (d-k+1) + (k-1)(r+1) - 1 = d + kr$, so is that of R_k. □

Now let us determine R_k's smooth and singular loci. The following result is true.

Theorem 2.3. *The singular locus of R_k is exactly R_{k-1}.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, a point $[s_{00} : \cdots : s_{0d} : \cdots : s_{r0} : \cdots : s_{rd}] \in R_k$ if and only if the rank of the matrix $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ is less than $2k$, in other words, R_k is the common zero locus of all the $2k \times 2k$ minor determinants of matrix $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$.

The singular locus of R_k is all the points where the rank of the matrix consisting of all the derivatives of locally defining functions of R_k with respect to local coordinates fails to be equal to the codimension of R_k in $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$.

For any point $[s_{00} : \cdots : s_{0d} : \cdots : s_{r0} : \cdots : s_{rd}] \in R_{k-1}$, the rank of the matrix $A_{(r+1)(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$ is less than $2(k-1)$. By the only lemma in [5], $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} = \operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)(k-1)\times(d+k-1)} + 1 < 2(k-1)+1 = 2k-1$. Suppose $s_{i_0 j_0} \neq 0$ for some i_0 and j_0. Then $s_{i_0 j_0}^{-2k}|M|$ are all the locally defining functions of R_k, where $|M|$ runs over all the $2k \times 2k$ minor determinants of matrix $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$. The derivatives of $s_{i_0 j_0}^{-2k}|M|$ with respect to the local coordinate $\frac{s_{ij}}{s_{i_0 j_0}}$ are linear combinations of $(2k-1)\times(2k-1)$ minor determinants of $s_{i_0 j_0}^{-2k}|M|$. Since $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} < 2k-1$, it follows that any $(2k-1)\times(2k-1)$ minor determinant of M vanishes, so do the derivatives of $s_{i_0 j_0}^{-2k}|M|$. Therefore all the derivatives of the local defining functions of R_k vanish on R_{k-1}, which implies that R_{k-1} is a subset of the singular locus of R_k.

In order to show that R_{k-1} is exactly the singular locus of R_k, we need to show that $R_k \setminus R_{k-1}$ is smooth.

Note that R_k parametrizes $(r+1)$-tuples $(f_0, \cdots, f_r)$ of homogeneous polynomials of degree d with at least $d-k+1$ common roots (count multiplicities). So given a point in R_k, we can find a homogeneous polynomial $p(x,y)$ of degree $d-k+1$ and a $(r+1)$-tuples $(g_0, \cdots, g_r)$ of homogeneous polynomials of degree $k-1$ such that $f_i(x,y) = p(x,y)g_i(x,y)$. Conversely, given any homogeneous polynomials $p(x,y)$ of degree $d-k+1$ and a $(r+1)$-tuples $(g_0, \cdots, g_r)$ of homogeneous polynomials of degree $k-1$, we can associate them with a point in R_k by letting $f_i(x,y) = p(x,y)g_i(x,y)$. This correspondence allows us to define a morphism $\Phi_k : \mathbb{P}^{(r+1)k-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k+1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ as $\Phi_k([\mu_{00} : \cdots : \mu_{0,k-1} : \mu_{10} : \cdots : \mu_{1,k-1} : \cdots : \mu_{r0} : \cdots : \mu_{r,k-1}]; [\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-k+1}]) = [\mu_{00}\nu_0 : \mu_{00}\nu_1 + \mu_{01}\nu_0 : \cdots : \mu_{0,k-1}\nu_{d-k+1} : \cdots : \mu_{r0}\nu_0 : \mu_{r0}\nu_1 + \mu_{r1}\nu_0 : \cdots : \mu_{r,k-1}\nu_{d-k+1}]$, or

equivalently, $\Phi_k(g_0, \cdots, g_r; p) = (g_0 p, \cdots, g_r p)$, where $\mathbb{P}^{(r+1)k-1}$ parametrizes $(r+1)$-tuples $(g_0, \cdots, g_r)$ with $g_i(x,y) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mu_{ij}\ x^{k-1-j} y^j$ $(i = 0, 1, \cdots, r)$ and $\mathbb{P}^{d-k+1}$ parametrizes $p(x,y) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-k+1} \nu_i x^{d-k+1-i} y^i$. It is easy to see that Φ_k is surjective over R_k and bijective (in fact isomorphic) from the preimage of $R_k \setminus R_{k-1}$ onto $R_k \setminus R_{k-1}$. Therefore $R_k \setminus R_{k-1}$ is smooth and R_{k-1} is the singular locus of R_k. □

We need the following lemma for future use.

Lemma 2.4. *The rank of $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ is less than $2k$ if and only if any its submatrix with the form*

$$B_{2k\times(d+k)} = \begin{pmatrix} * & * & \cdots & * & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ * & * & \cdots & * & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & * & * & \cdots & * & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & * & * & \cdots & * & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & * & * & \cdots & * \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & * & * & \cdots & * \end{pmatrix}_{2k\times(d+k)} \tag{2.2}$$

has rank less than $2k$, where the position marked by $(*, *, \cdots, *)$ in each row is filled with one of the vectors from $(s_{i0}, s_{i1}, \cdots, s_{id}), i = 0, \cdots, r$.

Proof. The "only if" part is trivial, so we only need to show the "if" part.

We use induction on k.

$k = 1$ is trivial.

Suppose that our lemma is true for $k-1$, i.e., that any submatrix in $A_{(r+1)(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$ with the form $B_{2(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$ has rank less than $2(k-1)$ implies the rank of $A_{(r+1)(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$ is less than $2(k-1)$. We need to show that the rank of $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ is less tahn $2k$ if all it submatrices with the form $B_{2k\times(d+k)}$ have rank less than $2k$.

Two subcases:

Subcase I: All of the submatrices with the form $B_{2(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$ have rank less than $2(k-1)$. By our inductive assumption $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)(k-1)\times(d+k-1)} < 2(k-1)$. By the only lemma in [5], which says that $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} = \operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)(k-1)\times(d+k-1)} + 1$ if $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)(k-1)\times(d+k-1)} < 2(k-1)$, we have that $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} =$
$\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)(k-1)\times(d+k-1)} + 1 < 2(k-1) + 1 < 2k$.

Subcase II: At least one of the submatrices with the form $B_{2(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$ has rank equal to $2(k-1)$. We will show that $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} = 2k - 1 < 2k$.

Denote the submatrix consisting of vectors from the $[(r+1)\cdot(i-1)+1]$-th row to the $[(r+1)\cdot i]$-th row in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ the i-th block, where $i = 1, \cdots, k$. By the assumption of subcase II, there is at least one matrix with the form $B_{2(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$ and rank $2(k-1)$. Pick a such matrix and still denote it $B_{2(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$. Let $\varepsilon_i, \eta_i, i = 1, \cdots, k-1$ be the

pairs of vectors obtained from $B_{2(k-1)\times(d+k-1)}$ by extending each row one more position from behind and filling it with zero. These vectors appear in the first $(k-1)$ blocks in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$. There exists a vector in the k-th block of $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$, say ε_k, which is linearly independent of any set of linearly independent vectors appearing in the first $(k-1)$ blocks. In particular, ε_k is linearly independent of $\varepsilon_i, \eta_i (i = 1, \cdots, k-1)$. Pick a vector ξ other than ε_k in the k-th block. Then ξ, together with ε_k and $\varepsilon_i, \eta_i (i = 1, \cdots, k-1)$, forms a matrix with the form $B_{2k\times(d+k)}$. By our assumption, its rank is less than $2k$. So ξ is a linear combination of ε_k and $\varepsilon_i, \eta_i, i = 1, \cdots, k-1$.

Let V be the vector space spanned by ε_k and $\varepsilon_i, \eta_i (i = 1, \cdots, k-1)$. We need to show that V contains any row in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$.

Since ξ is an arbitrary vector in the k-th block and we have showed that it is a linear combination of ε_k and $\varepsilon_i, \eta_i (i = 1, \cdots, k-1)$, it follows that V contains the k-th block.

We need the following claim before we can move on.

Claim 2.5. If the rank of a submatrix M of $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ consisting of the k-th block and another s blocks from the first $(k-1)$ ones is $2s+1$, then V contains all these $s+1$ blocks. Moreover, V contains all the k blocks in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$.

Proof. The pairs of ε_i, η_i in the s blocks and ε_k in the k-th block in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ form a submatrix of M and it has the same rank as M, thus any row in M is a linear combination of those ε_i, η_i $(i = 1, \cdots, k-1)$ and ε_k. Since ε_i, η_i $(i = 1, \cdots, k-1)$ and ε_k are vectors in V, it follows that V contains all these $s+1$ blocks.

If $s = k-1$, then V contains all the $s+1 = k$ blocks in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$, we are done.

Suppose $s < k-1$, we will show that we can produce s' blocks $(s' > s)$ among the first $(k-1)$ ones such that the rank of the matrix consisting of these s' blocks and the k-th block is $2s'+1$. The same argument as the first paragraph gives that V contains all these $s'+1$ blocks. If $s' < k-1$, replace s' by s and repeat the above process. After finite many steps we will end at $s' = k-1$, which exactly means that the rank of $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ is $2(k-1)+1 = 2k-1$ and V contains all the k blocks in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$.

Assume V contains the i_j-th $(j = 1, \cdots, s)$ blocks and the k-th block. Let V_1 be the space spanned by the rows in the i_j-th blocks $(j = 1, \cdots, s)$. By our assumption, $\dim V_1 = 2s$. In fact V_1 is generated by $\varepsilon_{i_j}, \eta_{i_j} (j = 1, \cdots, s)$. We have the following four possible cases:

(1) If $i_1 < \cdots < i_s$ are consective natural numbers and $i_s < k-1$, then we can shift the i_j-th block left by one unit for all $j = 1, \cdots, s$, where "shift left by one unit" means that the piece of $s_{i0}, s_{i1}, \cdots, s_{id}$ $(i = 0, \cdots, r)$ in each row in the i_j-th block is shifted left by one unit. Let V_2 be the space spanned by the row vectors in the (i_j+1)-th blocks, $j = 1, \cdots, s$. Then $\dim V_2 = \dim V_1 = 2s$. There are $(s-1)$ blocks contained in both V_1 and V_2 , each with a pair of ε_i, η_i, so $\dim(V_1 \cap V_2) \geq 2(s-1)$. Therefore $\dim(V_1 + V_2) = \dim V_1 + \dim V_2 - \dim(V_1 \cap V_2) \leq 2s + 2s - 2(s-1) = 2(s+1)$. However, $V_1 + V_2$ contains $s+1$ blocks among the first $(k-1)$ ones in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$, which is at least of rank $2(s+1)$, so $\dim(V_1+V_2) = 2(s+1)$. The vectors $\varepsilon_{i_j}, \eta_{i_j}, j = 1, \cdots, s$ and $\varepsilon_{i_s+1}, \eta_{i_s+1}$ in $V_1 + V_2$ are linearly independent, so it spans $V_1 + V_2$. Since $\varepsilon_{i_j}, \eta_{i_j}, j = 1, \cdots, s$ and $\varepsilon_{i_s+1}, \eta_{i_s+1}$ are vectors in V, we conclude that $V_1 + V_2$ is a subspace of V. So the rank of

the submatrix consisting of these $s+1$ blocks and the k-th block is $2(s+1)+1$, and V contains all these $s+2$ blocks.

(2) If $i_1 < \cdots < i_s$ are consective natural numbers and $i_s = k-1$, then we can shift the i_j-th block right by one unit for $j = 1, \cdots, s$ and repeat the above process to get that the rank of the submatrix consisting of $s+1$ blocks among the first $(k-1)$ ones in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ and the k-th block is $2(s+1)+1$, and V contains all these $s+2$ blocks.

(3) If $i_1 < \cdots < i_s$ are not consective natural numbers and $i_s < k-1$, then we can shift the i_j-th block left by one unit for $j = 1, \cdots, s$. Define V_1 and V_2 as before. Suppose V_1 and V_2 share t blocks. Then that i_j $(j = 1, \cdots, s)$ are not consective natural numbers implies $t \leq s-1$. Repeating the same process as in case (1), we can show that $\dim(V_1+V_2) = 2(s+s-t) = 2s+2(s-t) \geq 2(s+1)$ and V_1+V_2 is a subspace of V. Moreover, the rank of the submatrix consisting of the k-th block and the $(2s-t)$ blocks from the first $(k-1)$ ones in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ is $2(2s-t)+1 \geq 2(s+1)+1$, and V contains all these $2s-t+1 \geq s+2$ blocks.

(4) If $i_1 < \cdots < i_s$ are not consective natural numbers and $i_s = k-1$, we still shift the i_j-th block left by one unit for $j = 1, \cdots, s$. Define V_1 and V_2 as before. Suppose V_1 and V_2 share t bolcks. Since i_j, $j = 1, \cdots, s$ are not consective natural numbers and the $i_s+1 = k$-th block is not in V_1, we have $t \leq s-2$. Let $L\varepsilon_{i_j}, L\eta_{i_j} (j = 1, \cdots, s)$ be the vectors in V_2 obtained by shifting $\varepsilon_{i_j}, \eta_{i_j} (j = 1, \cdots, s)$ left by one unit. Then $L\varepsilon_{i_j}, L\eta_{i_j} (j = 1, \cdots, s)$ are linearly independent. The vectors $L\varepsilon_{i_s}, L\eta_{i_s}$ are in the k-th block. We know that any vector in the k-th block can be expressed as linear combination of $\varepsilon_{i_j}, \eta_{i_j} (j = 1, \cdots, s)$ and ε_k. Assume $L\varepsilon_{i_s} = a\varepsilon_k + \sum_{j=1}^{s} l_j\varepsilon_{i_j} + \sum_{j=1}^{s} m_j\eta_{i_j}$ and $L\eta_{i_s} = b\varepsilon_k + \sum_{j=1}^{s} l'_j\varepsilon_{i_j} + \sum_{j=1}^{s} m'_j\eta_{i_j}$. If one of a and b is zero, then $L\varepsilon_{i_s}$ or $L\eta_{i_s}$ is in V_1. Since $L\varepsilon_{i_s}$ and $L\eta_{i_s}$ are also in V_2, it follows that at least one of $L\varepsilon_{i_s}$ and $L\eta_{i_s}$ is in $V_1 \cap V_2$. Now the $2t$ pairs of $L\varepsilon_{i_j}, L\eta_{i_j}$ in the t common bolcks appear in $V_1 \cap V_2$, together with one of $L\varepsilon_{i_s}$ and $L\eta_{i_s}$, imply that $\dim(V_1 \cap V_2) \geq 2t+1$. If neither of a and b is zero, then $bL\varepsilon_{i_s} - aL\eta_{i_s} \neq 0$ is in $V_1 \cap V_2$. $bL\varepsilon_{i_s} - aL\eta_{i_s}$, together with the $2t$ pairs of $L\varepsilon_{i_j}, L\eta_{i_j}$ in the t common bolcks in $V_1 \cap V_2$, also gives that $\dim(V_1 \cap V_2) \geq 2t+1$. So $\dim(V_1+V_2) = \dim V_1 + \dim V_2 - \dim(V_1 \cap V_2) \leq 2s+2s-(2t+1) = 2s+2(s-1-t)+1$. But V_1+V_2 contains $s+s-t-1$ blocks from the first $(k-1)$ ones and the k-th block. The vectors consisting of the pairs of $\varepsilon_{i_j}, \eta_{i_j}$ and ε_k generate a subspace W of V_1+V_2 of dimension $2(2s-1-t)+1 = \dim(V_1+V_2)$. Hence $W = V_1+V_2$. Since all the pairs of $\varepsilon_{i_j}, \eta_{i_j}$ and ε_k are vectors in V, V contains V_1+V_2. Therefore the rank of the submatrix consisting of these $s+s-t-1 = s+(s-1-t)$ blocks from the first $(k-1)$ ones in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ and the k-th block is $2[s+(s-1-t)]+1 \geq 2(s+1)+1$ and V contains all these $s+(s-1-t)+1 \geq s+2$ blocks.

□

By Claim 2.5 we only need to show that there exists a submatrix M consisting of the k-th block and another s blocks from the first $(k-1)$ ones in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ such that $\operatorname{rank} M = 2s+1$.

Let us assign each block in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ a level number.

The level 0 consists of only one block, the k-th one. We have known that V contains the k-th block.

A block among the first $(k-1)$ blocks in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$, say the p-th one, is in the level 1 if there exists a row vector ξ in the k-th block such that $\xi = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i\varepsilon_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} b_i\eta_i + a\varepsilon_k$ and at least one of a_p and b_p is non-zero. WLOG, say $a_p \neq 0$. Then ε_p is a linear combination of $\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{p-1}, \eta_{p-1}, \eta_p, \varepsilon_{p+1}, \eta_{p+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k, \xi$. For any vector ζ in the p-th block, $\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{p-1}, \eta_{p-1}, \zeta, \eta_p, \varepsilon_{p+1}, \eta_{p+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k, \xi$ form a matrix with the form $B_{2k\times(d+k)}$. By our assumption, any such a matrix has rank less than $2k$. So ζ is a linear combination of $\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{p-1}, \eta_{p-1}, \eta_p, \varepsilon_{p+1}, \eta_{p+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k, \xi$. All the vectors $\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{p-1}, \eta_{p-1}, \eta_p, \varepsilon_{p+1}, \eta_{p+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k, \xi$ are in V, so is ζ. Since ζ is arbitrarily picked in the p-th block, it follows that V contains the p-th block.

Suppose the number of all blocks in the level 1 is s_1, then $s_1 \geq 1$. Since V contains all the blocks in the levels 0 and 1, we are done if $s_1 = k-1$. Otherwise $s_1 < k-1$. From the choice of the level 1, it is easy to see that the vectors $\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon_k$ span the k-th block, where $i_j (j = 1, \cdots, s_1)$ are the indices of the s_1 blocks in the level 1. If these vectors also span the s_1 blocks, we get a submatrix satisfying the assumption in Claim 2.5, hence we are done by Claim 2.5. Otherwise there exists at least one row ζ in a block in the level 1 , say the p-th one, such that the coefficients of ε_q or η_q is non-zero for some q if we express ζ as a linear combination of $\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k$, where $1 \leq q \leq k-1$ and the q-th block is not in the levels 0 and 1. We will show that V contains this q-th block.

To show that V contains the q-th block, we apply the same trick as we did before in proving that V contains the p-th block in the level 1.

Since the p-th block is in the level 1, there exists ξ in the k-th block such that $\xi = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i\varepsilon_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} b_i\eta_i + a\varepsilon_k$ and at least one of a_p and b_p is non-zero. WLOG, we assume $a_p \neq 0$. From the choice of the level 1, we see that ξ is in fact a linear combination of the pairs of $\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}$ and ε_k, where i_j $(j = 1, \cdots, s_1)$ are the indices of the blocks in the level 1. Suppose $i_x = p$ for some $1 \leq x \leq s_1$. It is easy to see that the vectors $\{\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon_k\}$ are linearly equivalent to $\{\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{x-1}}, \eta_{i_{x-1}}, \eta_{i_x} = \eta_p, \varepsilon_{i_{x+1}}, \eta_{i_{x+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_k, \xi\}$. Obviously, the vectors $\{\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{p-1}, \eta_{p-1}, \eta_p, \varepsilon_{p+1}, \eta_{p+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k, \xi\}$ are linearly equivalent to $\{\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k, \}$, so they form a new basis of V. The equivalence between the vectors $\{\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon_k\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{x-1}}, \eta_{i_{x-1}}, \eta_{i_x} = \eta_p, \varepsilon_{i_{x+1}}, \eta_{i_{x+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_k, \xi\}$ implies that the coefficients of ε_q or η_q is also non-zero when we expand ζ under this new basis. WLOG, assume the coefficients of ε_q is not zero. Then clearly $\{\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{p-1}, \eta_{p-1}, \zeta, \eta_p, \varepsilon_{p+1}, \eta_{p+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{q-1}, \eta_{q-1}, \eta_q, \varepsilon_{q+1}, \eta_{q+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k, \xi\}$ form a basis of V. Any vector in the q-th block, together with this basis, forms a matrix with the form $B_{2k\times(d+k)}$. By our assumption, the rank of such a matrix is less than $2k$. So any vector in the q-th block is a linear combination of $\{\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{p-1}, \eta_{p-1}, \zeta, \eta_p, \varepsilon_{p+1}, \eta_{p+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{q-1}, \eta_{q-1}, \eta_q, \varepsilon_{q+1}, \eta_{q+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k, \xi\}$. Therefore V contains the q-th block.

Let the level 2 consisting of all the possible q-th block like the above one. Denote s_2 the total number of the blocks in the level 2. Then V contains all the blocks in the levels 0, 1 and 2. If one of the following two cases happens, we are done.

(a) All the blocks in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$ have already appeared in the levels 0, 1 or 2, then $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} = \dim V = 2k-1$.

or

(b) The vectors $\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+s_2}}$ and ε_k span the level 2, where $i_j, j = 1, \cdots, s_1$ are the indices of the blocks in the level 1 and $i_j, j = s_1+1, \cdots, s_1+s_2$ are the indices of the blocks in the level 2 .

If the case (b) happens, then the blocks in the levels $0, 1$ and 2 form a submatrix of rank $2(s_1+s_2)+1$. By Claim 2.5, V contains all the blocks in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$, so $\operatorname{rank} A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} = \dim V = 2k-1$.

If neither case above happens, then we can proceed to pick up blocks in the level 3.

Since there are only k blocks in total in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$, after finitely many steps, say r, we must either end at the case that V contains all the blocks in the levels $0, \cdots, r$ and these levels have already included all the blocks in $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)}$, or the vectors $\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_r}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_r}}$ and ε_k span the level r, where $i_j (j = s_1+\cdots+s_{p-1}+1, \cdots, s_1+\cdots+s_{p-1}+s_p)$ are the indices of the blocks in the level p, $(p = 1, \cdots, r)$. In either case we have that the rank of $A_{(r+1)k\times(d+k)} = \dim V = 2k-1 < 2k$.

Sharp eyes may have detected that there is a missing point in the above argument, that is, we did not show that V contains all the blocks in the level $l (1 \le l \le r)$. This can be done by induction on l.

The following property (P_l) is crucial and it is true for any level $l (1 \le l \le r)$.

(P_l): For any block, say $\bar{q}$-th, in the level l, there exists a set of linearly independent vectors $\{\varepsilon'_k, \eta'_k, \varepsilon'_{i_1}, \eta'_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}\} \backslash \{\varepsilon'_{\bar{q}}\}$, which is linearly equivalent to the set of vectors $\{\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \varepsilon_k\}$, where $i_j (j = s_1+\cdots+s_{p-1}+1, \cdots, s_1+\cdots+s_{p-1}+s_p)$ are the indices of the blocks in the level p $(p = 1, \cdots, l)$ and ε'_k, η'_k are vectors in the k-th block (the level 0).

(P_1) has been shown true in the above.

Suppose (P_{l-1}) is true.

For any block, say $\bar{q}$-th, in the level l, there exists at least one row ζ in a block in the level $l-1$, say the $\bar{p}$-th one, such that at least one of the coefficients of $\varepsilon_{\bar{q}}$ and $\eta_{\bar{q}}$ is non-zero when we express ζ as a linear combination of $\{\varepsilon_1, \eta_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}, \varepsilon_k\}$ and no row in the levels less than $l-1$ has this property. Since (P_{l-1}) is true, that is, there exists a set of linearly independent vectors $\{\varepsilon'_k, \eta'_k, \varepsilon'_{i_1}, \eta'_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}}}\} \backslash \{\varepsilon'_{\bar{p}}\}$, which is linearly equivalent to the set of vectors $\{\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}}}, \varepsilon_k\}$, where $i_j (j = s_1+\cdots+s_{p-1}+1, \cdots, s_1+\cdots+s_{p-1}+s_p)$ are the indices of the blocks in the level p $(p = 1, \cdots, l-1)$ and ε'_k, η'_k are vectors in the k-th block. The linear equivalence between these two sets of vectors implies that ζ still has at least one non-zero coefficient in front of $\varepsilon_{\bar{q}}$ or $\eta_{\bar{q}}$ when we express it as a linear combination of $\{\varepsilon'_k, \eta'_k, \varepsilon'_{i_1}, \eta'_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}\}$

$\backslash\{\varepsilon'_{\bar{p}}\}$. WLOG, assume the coefficient of $\varepsilon_{\bar{q}}$ is non-zero. Then $\{\varepsilon'_k, \eta'_k, \varepsilon'_{i_1}, \eta'_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \zeta\} \setminus \{\varepsilon'_{\bar{p}}, \varepsilon'_{\bar{q}}\}$ is a set of linearly independent vectors, which is with the form required in (P_l) and linearly equivalent to the set of vectors $\{\varepsilon_{i_1}, \eta_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \varepsilon_k\}$. Hence (P_l) is true.

It is easy to see that $\{\varepsilon'_k, \eta'_k, \varepsilon'_{i_1}, \eta'_{i_1}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1}}, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \eta'_{i_{s_1+s_2}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_{l-1}+1}}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \eta_{i_{s_1+\cdots+s_l}}, \zeta\} \setminus \{\varepsilon'_{\bar{p}}, \varepsilon'_{\bar{q}}\}$, together with all the other ε_i, η_i not in the levels $0, 1, \cdots$, and l, form a basis of V. Any row in the $\bar{q}$-th block, together with this basis, form a matrix with the form $B_{2k\times(d+k)}$. So this row is a linear combination of the above basis, hence it is in V. Since we pick the row arbitrarily from any $\bar{q}$-th block in the level l, it follows that V contains the level l. This completes the proof of the subcase II. Hence the "if" part in the lemma 2.4 is true. As we said before, the "only if" part is trivial, so lemma 2.4 follows.

□

3 Iterated Blow-ups

In this section we will prove the theorem 1.1.

We follow J. Harris [2] on the definition of blow-up.

Definition 3.1. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^m$ be any projective variety and $Y \subseteq X$ a subvariety. Take a collection $F_0, \cdots, F_n$ of homogeneous polynomials in $I(X)$ of the same degree generating an ideal with saturation $I(Y)$ (this does not have to be a minimal set). Consider the rational map

$$\varphi : X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$$

given by

$$\varphi(x) = [F_0, \cdots, F_n]$$

Clearly, φ is regular on the complement $X \setminus Y$, and in general won't be on Y; thus the graph Γ_φ (closure of the graph of the rational map φ) will map isomorphically to X away from Y, but not in general over Y. The graph Γ_φ, together with the projection $\pi : \Gamma_\varphi \longrightarrow X$, is called the blow-up of X along Y and sometimes denoted as $Bl_Y X$ or simply $\tilde{X}$. The inverse image $E = \pi^{-1}(Y) \subseteq \tilde{X}$ is called the exceptional divisor.

Note that this definition of blow-up is a generalization of the usual one in Theorem 1.1, which requires both X and Y are smooth. In the case of X and Y both smooth, the above definition coincides with the usual one.

Since we start the iterated blow-ups from a smooth variety $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$, to carry out the iterated process, we only need to show that the center we blow up along at each step is smooth. The advantage of using this equivalent definition is that we can construct blow-ups explicitly, while the disadvantage is that it brings us heavy notations.

We will prove our theorem by induction on d.

$d = 1$.

There is only one stratum R_1, which is smooth and of dimension $1+r$. Blow up $\mathbb{P}^{2(r+1)-1}$ along R_1 produces a smooth variety. Its boundary consists of only one divisor, the exceptional one, which is of course normal crossing. Hence Theorem 1.1 is trivially true for $d=1$.

Suppose that Theorem 1.1 is true for all the spaces of holomorphic maps from $\mathbb{P}^1$ into $\mathbb{P}^r$ of degree less than d. We need to prove that it is also true for the space of holomorphic maps from $\mathbb{P}^1$ into $\mathbb{P}^r$ of degree d.

For the space of holomorphic maps from $\mathbb{P}^1$ into $\mathbb{P}^r$ of degree d, its boundary $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r)\setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ in $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ has a natural stratification $R_1\subset R_2\cdots\subset R_k$. R_1 is smooth, so we can blow up $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ along R_1 to get Γ_{φ_1}, where φ_1 is a rational map associated with the ideal $I(R_1)$. However, R_2 is singular along R_1, in order to carry out the second blow-up in the usual sense, we need to show that the proper transformation $\widetilde{R}_2$ of R_2 in Γ_{φ_1} is smooth. Similarly, assume that we have carried out the first k blow-ups. If $k=d$, we are done. If $k<d$, to proceed to the next blow-up, we have to show that the proper transformation $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$ of R_{k+1} in Γ_{φ_k} is smooth.

The idea to show that $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$ is smooth is very simple. We first construct a birational morphism $\Phi_{k+1}:\mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-k}\longrightarrow R_{k+1}\subset\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$. The space $\mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1}$ can be viewed as $M_k(\mathbb{P}^r)$. Since $k<d$, by our inductive assumption, we can carry out the iterated blow-ups to get a compactification of $M_k^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$. Denote the final outcome Γ'_{φ_k}, which is a smooth variety. We show that there is an isomorphism between $\Gamma'_{\varphi_k}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-k}$ and $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$. Therefore $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$ is smooth.

Remark 3.2. The reader may feel our induction a little weird. It seems that we use little information on the first k blow-ups in the proof of the smoothness of $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$. However, we do need to assume that we can carry them out to get a smooth variety Γ_{φ_k} before we can move ahead.

Now let us show that the proper transformation $\widetilde{R}_2$ of R_2 in Γ_{φ_1} is smooth.

Consider the birational morphism $\Phi_2:\mathbb{P}^{2(r+1)-1}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-1}\longrightarrow R_2\subset\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$, where $\Phi_2([\mu_{00}:\mu_{01}:\mu_{10}:\mu_{11}:\cdots:\mu_{r0}:\mu_{r1}];[\nu_0:\cdots:\nu_{d-1}])=[\mu_{00}\nu_0:\mu_{00}\nu_1+\mu_{01}\nu_0:\cdots:\mu_{00}\nu_{d-1}+\mu_{01}\nu_{d-2}:\mu_{01}\nu_{d-1}:\cdots:\mu_{r0}\nu_0:\mu_{r0}\nu_1+\mu_{r1}\nu_0:\cdots:\mu_{r0}\nu_{d-1}+\mu_{r1}\nu_{d-2}:\mu_{r1}\nu_{d-1}]$. Since $\mathbb{P}^{2(r+1)-1}$ parametrizes the space of $(r+1)$-tuples polynomials of degree 1 modulo homothety, we can blow it up along its unique stratum. Denote the associated rational map φ_1' and the resulting variety $\Gamma_{\varphi_1'}$. Then we claim that there exists a morphism F from $\Gamma_{\varphi_1'}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ into $\widetilde{R}_2\subset\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$, which is an isomorphism. So $\widetilde{R}_2$ is smooth.

By lemma 2.4 the unique stratum R_1' in $\mathbb{P}^{2(r+1)-1}$ is generated by all 2×2 determinants $\left|\begin{smallmatrix}\mu_{i0}&\mu_{i1}\\ \mu_{j0}&\mu_{j1}\end{smallmatrix}\right|$, where $0\le i<j\le r$. Hence the rational map $\varphi_1':\mathbb{P}^{2(r+1)-1}\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1}$ is defined as $\varphi_1'([\mu_{00}:\mu_{01}:\cdots:\mu_{r0}:\mu_{r1}])=[\left|\begin{smallmatrix}\mu_{00}&\mu_{01}\\ \mu_{10}&\mu_{11}\end{smallmatrix}\right|:\cdots:\left|\begin{smallmatrix}\mu_{r-1,0}&\mu_{r-1,1}\\ \mu_{r0}&\mu_{r1}\end{smallmatrix}\right|]$. Denote τ_{ij} as the coordinates in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1}$.

By lemma 2.4, R_1 is generated by all 2×2 determinants $\left|\begin{smallmatrix}s_{im}&s_{in}\\ s_{jm}&s_{jn}\end{smallmatrix}\right|$. Blowing up $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ along R_1, we get Γ_{φ_1}, where φ_1 is the rational map $\varphi_1:\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ given by $\varphi_1([s_{00}:\cdots:s_{0d}:\cdots:s_{r0}:\cdots:s_{rd}])=[\left|\begin{smallmatrix}s_{00}&s_{01}\\ s_{10}&s_{11}\end{smallmatrix}\right|:\cdots:\left|\begin{smallmatrix}s_{im}&s_{in}\\ s_{jm}&s_{jn}\end{smallmatrix}\right|:\cdots:\left|\begin{smallmatrix}s_{r-1,d-1}&s_{r-1,d}\\ s_{r,d-1}&s_{r,d}\end{smallmatrix}\right|]$. Denote $u_{ij,mn}$ as the coordinates in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$, where $0\le i<j\le$

$r, 0 \le m < n \le d$.

Define a morphism $F : \Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1} \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\varphi_1}$ as $F([\mu_{00} : \mu_{01} : \cdots : \mu_{r0} : \mu_{r1}]; [\tau_{01} : \cdots : \tau_{r-1,r}]; [\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}]) = [\mu_{0,0}\nu_0 : \mu_{0,0}\nu_1 + \mu_{0,1}\nu_0 : \cdots : \mu_{0,0}\nu_{d-1} + \mu_{0,1}\nu_{d-2} : \mu_{0,1}\nu_{d-1} : \cdots : \mu_{r,0}\nu_0 : \mu_{r,0}\nu_1 + \mu_{r,1}\nu_0 : \cdots : \mu_{r,0}\nu_{d-1} + \mu_{r,1}\nu_{d-2} : \mu_{r,1}\nu_{d-1}]; [\nu_0^2\tau_{01} : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}\tau_{01} : \cdots : (\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n)\ \tau_{ij} : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}\tau_{r-1,r} : \nu_1\nu_{d-1}\tau_{r-1,r} : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}^2\tau_{r-1,r}]$. It is easy to see that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1} & \xrightarrow{F} & \widetilde{R}_2 \subset \Gamma_{\varphi_1} \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_1'} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_1} \\ \mathbb{P}^{2(r+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1} & \xrightarrow{\Phi_2} & \mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1} \end{array}$$

is commutative.

The image of F included in $\widetilde{R}_2$ can be obtained as follows. Let E_1' be the exceptional divisor of the blow up $\pi_1' : \Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{2(r+1)-1}$. From $F(\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \setminus E_1' \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1}) = \pi_1^{-1}(R_2 \setminus R_1)$, we have that $F(\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \setminus E_1' \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1}) \subset \overline{\pi_1^{-1}(R_2 \setminus R_1)} = \widetilde{R}_2$, that is, $\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \setminus E_1' \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1} \subset F^{-1}(\widetilde{R}_2)$. Since F is continuous, $F^{-1}(\widetilde{R}_2)$ is closed. Thus $\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1} = \overline{\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \setminus E_1' \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1}} \subset F^{-1}(\widetilde{R}_2)$, i.e., $F(\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1}) \subset \widetilde{R}_2$.

Let us show that F is injective.

Suppose two points $P = ([\mu_{00} : \mu_{01} : \cdots : \mu_{r0} : \mu_{r1}]; [\tau_{01} : \cdots : \tau_{r-1,r}]; [\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}])$ and $\bar{P} = ([\bar{\mu}_{00} : \bar{\mu}_{01} : \cdots : \bar{\mu}_{r0} : \bar{\mu}_{r1}]; [\bar{\tau}_{01} : \cdots : \bar{\tau}_{r-1,r}]; [\bar{\nu}_0 : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_{d-1}])$ have the same image under F, we need to show that $P = \bar{P}$.

From the definition of F, $F(P) = F(\bar{P})$ implies that $[\nu_0^2\tau_{01} : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}\tau_{01} : \cdots : (\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n)\ \tau_{ij} : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}\tau_{r-1,r} : \nu_1\nu_{d-1}\tau_{r-1,r} : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}^2\tau_{r-1,r}] = [\bar{\nu}_0^2\bar{\tau}_{01} : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_0\bar{\nu}_{d-1}\bar{\tau}_{01} : \cdots : (\bar{\nu}_m\bar{\nu}_{n-1} - \bar{\nu}_{m-1}\bar{\nu}_n)\ \bar{\tau}_{ij} : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_0\bar{\nu}_{d-1}\bar{\tau}_{r-1,r} : \bar{\nu}_1\bar{\nu}_{d-1}\bar{\tau}_{r-1,r} : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_{d-1}^2\bar{\tau}_{r-1,r}]$. Let $\tau_{i^\circ j^\circ}$ be the last non-zero element in the lexicographical order among the coordinates of P in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1}$ and ν_q be the last non-zero element in the natural order $\nu_0, \cdots, \nu_{d-1}$ in the coordinates of P in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$. Then pick $m = q, n = q+1$, we have $(\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n)\tau_{ij} = \nu_q^2\tau_{i^\circ j^\circ} \neq 0$. So the corresponding coordinate $(\bar{\nu}_q\bar{\nu}_{(q+1)-1} - \bar{\nu}_{q-1}\bar{\nu}_{q+1})\bar{\tau}_{i^\circ j^\circ} = \bar{\nu}_q^2\bar{\tau}_{i^\circ j^\circ}$ in $F(\bar{P})$ is also non-zero, which implies that the last non-zero element in the lexicographical order among the coordinates of $\bar{P}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1}$ is $\bar{\tau}_{i^\circ j^\circ}$ or an element behind it and the last non-zero element in the natural order $\bar{\nu}_0, \cdots, \bar{\nu}_{d-1}$ in the coordinates of $\bar{P}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ is $\bar{\nu}_q$ or an element behind it. But P and $\bar{P}$ take symmetric roles above, so $\bar{\tau}_{i^\circ j^\circ}$ is exactly the last non-zero element in the lexicographical order among the coordinates of $\bar{P}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1}$ and $\bar{\nu}_q$ is the last non-zero element in the natural order $\bar{\nu}_0, \cdots, \bar{\nu}_{d-1}$ in the coordinates of $\bar{P}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$. WLOG, take $\nu_q = \bar{\nu}_q = \tau_{i^\circ j^\circ} = \bar{\tau}_{i^\circ j^\circ} = 1$. From $[\nu_0^2\tau_{01} : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}\tau_{01} : \cdots : (\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n)\ \tau_{ij} : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}\tau_{r-1,r} : \nu_1\nu_{d-1}\tau_{r-1,r} : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}^2\tau_{r-1,r}] = [\bar{\nu}_0^2\bar{\tau}_{01} : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_0\bar{\nu}_{d-1}\bar{\tau}_{01} : \cdots : (\bar{\nu}_m\bar{\nu}_{n-1} - \bar{\nu}_{m-1}\bar{\nu}_n)\ \bar{\tau}_{ij} : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_0\bar{\nu}_{d-1}\bar{\tau}_{r-1,r} : \bar{\nu}_1\bar{\nu}_{d-1}\bar{\tau}_{r-1,r} : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_{d-1}^2\bar{\tau}_{r-1,r}]$, we have that $(\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n)\tau_{ij} = (\bar{\nu}_m\bar{\nu}_{n-1} - \bar{\nu}_{m-1}\bar{\nu}_n)\bar{\tau}_{ij}$ for $0 \le i < j \le r, 0 \le m < n \le d$, where $\nu_{-1} = \bar{\nu}_{-1} = \nu_d = \bar{\nu}_d = 0$. Take $i = i^\circ, j = j^\circ$ in the above equality, we have $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n = \bar{\nu}_m\bar{\nu}_{n-1} - \bar{\nu}_{m-1}\bar{\nu}_n$ for $0 \le m < n \le d$. And take $m = q, n = q+1$, we

have $\tau_{ij} = \bar{\tau}_{ij}$ for $0 \leq i < j \leq r$.

We claim that $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n$ $(0 \leq m < n \leq d)$ generate all the monomials of degree 2 in variables $\nu_0, \cdots, \nu_{d-1}$.

Take $m = 0, n = 1$, we have $\nu_0\nu_{1-1} - \nu_{0-1}\nu_1 = \nu_0^2$. Similarly, take $m = 0, n = j (1 < j \leq d)$, we have $\nu_0\nu_{j-1} - \nu_{0-1}\nu_j = \nu_0\nu_{j-1}$. So $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n$ $(0 \leq m < n \leq d)$ generate all $\nu_0\nu_i$ for $i = 0, \cdots, d-1$.

Suppose $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n$ $(0 \leq m < n \leq d)$ have generated all the monomials in front of $\nu_i\nu_j$ in the lexicographical order for some $0 \leq i < j \leq d$. Then, take $m = i, n = j+1$, we have that $\nu_i\nu_j = (\nu_i\nu_j - \nu_{i-1}\nu_{j+1}) + \nu_{i-1}\nu_{j+1}$. By our assumption, $\nu_{i-1}\nu_{j+1}$ is generated by $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n$ $(0 \leq m < n \leq d)$, so is $\nu_i\nu_j$. Hence $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n$ $(0 \leq m < n \leq d)$ generate all the monomials of degree 2 in variables $\nu_0, \cdots, \nu_{d-1}$.

Because all the monomials of degree 2 in variables $\nu_0, \cdots, \nu_{d-1}$ give the 2-uple embedding of $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ into $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$, two points in $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ will have to coincide if they have the same image in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ under the 2-uple embedding.

Now $F(P) = F(\bar{P})$ implies that $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n = \bar{\nu}_m\bar{\nu}_{n-1} - \bar{\nu}_{m-1}\bar{\nu}_n$ for $0 \leq m < n \leq d$. The previous equation, together with the fact that $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n$ $(0 \leq m < n \leq d)$ generate all the monomials of degree 2 in variables $\nu_0, \cdots, \nu_{d-1}$, gives that $\nu_i\nu_j = \bar{\nu}_i\bar{\nu}_j$ for all $0 \leq i < j \leq d-1$. Therefore $\nu_i = \bar{\nu}_i$ for $i = 0, \cdots, d-1$.

By the definition of Φ_2, we see that $[\mu_{00} : \mu_{01} : \cdots : \mu_{r0} : \mu_{r1}] = [\bar{\mu}_{00} : \bar{\mu}_{01} : \cdots : \bar{\mu}_{r0} : \bar{\mu}_{r1}]$ follows from $\pi_1(F(P)) = \pi_1(F(\bar{P}))$ and $[\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}] = [\bar{\nu}_0 : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_d)]$. Hence F is injective.

Let us show that F is onto $\widetilde{R}_2$.

Since F is an injective morphism, $F(\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1})$ is closed in Γ_{φ_1}. From $F(\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \setminus E_1' \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1}) = \pi_1^{-1}(R_2 \setminus R_1)$, we see that $\pi_1^{-1}(R_2 \setminus R_1) \subset F(\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1})$. Hence $\widetilde{R}_2$, the closure of $\pi_1^{-1}(R_2 \setminus R_1)$ in Γ_{φ_1} is a subset of $F(\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1})$. Therefore F is onto $\widetilde{R}_2$.

Now F is a bijection between $\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ and $\widetilde{R}_2$. In order to show that F is an isomorphism, it is enough to show that F is a closed immersion.

By a local criterion on closed immersion (see, for example, Proposition 7.3, Chapter II in Hartshorne [3]), we need to verify that the coordinate functions in F separate points and tangent vectors. As showed above, the coordinate functions in F separate points. Now let us prove that they also separate tangent vectors.

Since F is a homeomorphism onto $\tilde{R}_2$, to show that the coordinate functions in F separate tangent vectors, it is enough to show that the morphsim of sheaves $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{R}_2} \longrightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1}}$ is surjective. We check this surjectivity on stalks.

From the proof of injectivity, we see that F restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ gives a morphism $G : \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$, that is, $G([\tau_{01} : \cdots : \tau_{r-1,r}]; [\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}]) = [\nu_0^2\tau_{01} : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}\tau_{01} : \cdots : (\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n)\tau_{ij} : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}\tau_{r-1,r} : \nu_1\nu_{d-1}\tau_{r-1,r} : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}^2\tau_{r-1,r}]$. Let $\tilde{G} : \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+1}{2}-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ be the standard Serge embedding. Then G can be decomposed as $\tilde{G} \circ H$, where $H : \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ is the morphism sending $([\tau_{01} : \cdots : \tau_{r-1,r}]; [\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}])$ into $([\tau_{01} : \cdots : \tau_{r-1,r}]; [\nu_0^2 : \cdots : (\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n) : \cdots : \nu_0\nu_{d-1}]$. Since $\tilde{G}$ is still an

embedding when restricted to the image of H, so locally $\tau_{ij}(0 \le i < j \le r)$ and $\nu_m\nu_{n-1} - \nu_{m-1}\nu_n(0 \le m < n \le d)$ are regular functions in term of the coordinates $u_{ij,mn}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$. Since $\nu_m\nu_{n-1}-\nu_{m-1}\nu_n, 0 \le m < n \le d$ generate all the monomials of degree 2 in variables $\nu_0, \cdots, \nu_{d-1}$, it follows that any $\nu_i\nu_j$ $(0 \le i \le j \le d-1)$ is locally a regular functions in terms of the coordinates $u_{ij,mn}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$. All the monomials of degree 2 in variables $\nu_0, \cdots, \nu_{d-1}$ define a 2-uple embedding of $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}$ into $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$, which implies that ν_i $(i = 0, \cdots, d-1)$ are locally regular functions in terms of the coordinates $u_{ij,mn}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ as well.

Given any point Q in $\widetilde{R}_2$, let $F^{-1}(Q) = P$. We need to show that $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{R}_2,Q} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\varphi_1'}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-1},P}$ is surjective.

Let $\mu_{i'j'}$, $\tau_{s't'}$ and $\nu_{q'}$ be the last non-zero elements in the lexicographical order among $[\mu_{00} : \mu_{01} : \cdots : \mu_{r0} : \mu_{r1}]$, $[\tau_{01} : \cdots : \tau_{r-1,r}]$ and $[\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-1}]$ in the coordinate of P, respectively. Then $\mu_{i'j'} = \tau_{s't'} = \nu_{q'} = 1$ gives an affine neighborhood U of P. From the definition of F, we see that $s_{i',q'+j'} = 1$ gives an affine neighborhood V of Q. Obviously P is also in the open set $1 - \nu_{q'-}\nu_{q'+1} \neq 0$. Shrinking the affine neighborhoods if necessary, we may assume that $F(U) = V$ and $1 - \nu_{q'-1}\nu_{q'+1} \neq 0$.

Now on U and V we have $\mu_{i0}\nu_{q'} + \nu_{i1}\nu_{q'-1} = s_{iq'}$, $\mu_{i0}\nu_{q'+1} + \nu_{i1}\nu_{q'} = s_{i,q'+1}$. Since $\nu_{q'} = 1$, it follows from the previous two equations that $\mu_{i0} = \frac{s_{iq'}-\nu_{q'-1}s_{i,q'+1}}{1-\nu_{q'-1}\nu_{q'+1}}$ and $\mu_{i1} = \frac{s_{i,q'+1}-\nu_{q'+1}s_{iq'}}{1-\nu_{q'-1}\nu_{q'+1}}$. Hence μ_{i0}, μ_{i1} $(i = 0, \cdots, r)$ are locally regular functions in terms of s_{ij} $(0 \le i \le r, 0 \le j \le d)$ and ν_i $(i = 0, \cdots, d-1)$. We have proved that ν_i $(i = 0, \cdots, d-1)$ are locally regular functions in terms of the coordinates $u_{ij,mn}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$. So $\mu_{i0}, \mu_{i1}, i = 0, \cdots, r$ are locally regular functions in terms of s_{ij} $(0 \le i \le r, 0 \le j \le d)$ and $u_{ij,mn}$s. Clearly μ_{i0}, μ_{i1} $(i = 0, \cdots, r)$, τ_{ij} $(0 \le i < j \le r)$ and ν_i $(i = 0, \cdots, d-1)$ span $\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\varphi_1'}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-1},P}$. From all the above, the surjectivity of $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{R}_2,Q} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\varphi_1'}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-1},P}$ follows. Therefore F is a closed immersion.

That F is a bijection and closed immersion implies $F : \Gamma_{\varphi_1'} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-1} \longrightarrow \widetilde{R}_2$ is an isomorphism (see, for example, J. Harris [2] Corollary 14.10), thus the smoothness of $\widetilde{R}_2$ follows.

Before we proceed, let us spend some time on setting up notations and explain why we need such ugly ones.

Blowing up Γ_{φ_1} along $\widetilde{R}_2$, we need a set of generators of $I(\widetilde{R}_2)$.

Recall that $\varphi_1([s_{00} : \cdots : s_{0d} : \cdots : s_{r0} : \cdots : s_{rd}]) = [|\begin{smallmatrix} s_{00} & s_{01} \\ s_{10} & s_{11} \end{smallmatrix}| : \cdots : |\begin{smallmatrix} s_{im} & s_{in} \\ s_{jm} & s_{jn} \end{smallmatrix}| : \cdots : |\begin{smallmatrix} s_{r-1,d-1} & s_{r-1,d} \\ s_{r,d-1} & s_{r,d} \end{smallmatrix}|]$, which sends points outside R_1 in $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ into $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$. We use $u_{ij,mn}$ as the coordinates in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$, where $0 \le i < j \le r, 0 \le m < n \le d$. Over the general points in the image of φ_1, $[u_{01,01} : \cdots : u_{ij,mn} : \cdots : u_{r-1,r;d-1,d}] = [|\begin{smallmatrix} s_{00} & s_{0,1} \\ s_{10} & s_{11} \end{smallmatrix}| : \cdots : |\begin{smallmatrix} s_{im} & s_{in} \\ s_{jm} & s_{jn} \end{smallmatrix}| : \cdots : |\begin{smallmatrix} s_{r-1,d-1} & s_{r-1,d} \\ s_{r,d-1} & s_{r,d} \end{smallmatrix}|]$.

By Lemma 2.4, R_2 is generated by all the 4×4 minor determinants of matrices with the form $B_{4,d+2}$. Expanding all such 4×4 determinants into 2×2 multiplying 2×2 determinants, we conclude that the closure $\overline{\varphi_1(R_2 \setminus R_1)}$ of $\varphi_1(R_2 \setminus R_1)$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ is generated by $u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2}u_{i_3,i_4;m_3-1,m_4-1} - u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_3}u_{i_3,i_4;m_2-1,m_4-1} + u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_4}u_{i_3,i_4;m_2-1,m_3-1} +$

$u_{i_1,i_2;m_2,m_3}u_{i_3,i_4;m_1-1,m_4-1}-u_{i_1,i_2;m_2,m_4}u_{i_3,i_4;m_1-1,m_3-1}+u_{i_1,i_2;m_3,m_4}u_{i_3,i_4;m_1-1,m_2-1}$, where $0 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq r$ and $0 \leq i_3 < i_4 \leq r$ and $0 \leq m_1 < m_2 < m_3 < m_4 \leq d+1$. The pull-back of $\overline{\varphi_1(R_2 \setminus R_1)}$ into Γ_{φ_1} by the projection $\Gamma_{\varphi_1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ is $\widetilde{R}_2$. It is easy to see that $\widetilde{R}_2$ is cut out by the same polynomials in Γ_{φ_1}.

The blow up of Γ_{φ_1} along $\widetilde{R}_2$ is the graph Γ_{φ_2} of the rational map $\varphi_2 : \Gamma_{\varphi_1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2\cdot\binom{d+2}{4}-1}$, where φ_2 maps general points in Γ_{φ_1} to $[u_{01;01}u_{01;12} - u_{01;02}u_{01;02}+ u_{01;03}u_{01;01} : \cdots : u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2}u_{i_3,i_4;m_3-1,m_4-1} - u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_3}u_{i_3,i_4;m_2-1,m_4-1} + u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_4} u_{i_3,i_4;m_2-1,m_3-1} + u_{i_1,i_2;m_2,m_3}\ u_{i_3,i_4;m_1-1,m_4-1} - u_{i_1,i_2;m_2,m_4}u_{i_3,i_4;m_1-1,m_3-1} + u_{i_1,i_2;m_3,m_4} u_{i_3,i_4;m_1-1,m_2-1} : \cdots : u_{r-1,r;d-2,d-1}\ u_{r-1,r;d-1,d} - u_{r-1,r;d-2,d}u_{r-1,r;d-2,d} + u_{r-1,r;d-1,d} u_{r-1,r;d-3,d}]$. We use $u_{i_1,i_2,i_3,i_4;m_1,m_2,m_3,m_4}$ as the coordinates in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2\cdot\binom{d+2}{4}-1}$. From the construction of φ_1 and φ_2, we see that the coordinate of general point in the image of φ_2 is equal to $[|M_{01,01;0123}| : \cdots : |M_{i_1i_2,i_3i_4;m_1m_2m_3m_4}| : \cdots : |M_{r-1,r,r-1,r;d-2,d-1,d,d+1}|]$, where $|M_{i_1i_2,i_3i_4;m_1m_2m_3m_4}|$ is the determinant of the 4×4 submatrix consisting of (i_1+1)-th,(i_2+1)-th rows from the first block and (i_3+1)-th,(i_4+1)-th rows from the second block and (m_j+1)-th columns $(j=1,\cdots,4)$ in $A_{2(r+1)\times(d+2)}$.

By Lemma 2.4, R_3 is generated by 6×6 minor determinants of submatrices with the form $B_{6,d+3}$. These 6×6 determinants cannot be expanded as linear combinations of product of 4×4 determinants of form $|M_{i_1i_2,i_3i_4;m_1m_2m_3m_4}|$, so the defining equations of $\overline{\varphi_2 \circ \pi_1^{-1}(R_3 \setminus R_2)}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2\cdot\binom{d+2}{4}-1}$ are not so obvious now. However, we find that we can add a 2×2 determinant at the corner of the 6×6 determinant to form a 8×8 determinant and then expand this 8×8 determinant into linear combinations of product of two 4×4 determinants of form $|M_{i_1i_2,i_3i_4;m_1m_2m_3m_4}|$. Specifically we have the following

$$\begin{vmatrix} s_{i_1,m_1} & \cdots & s_{i_1,m_6} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_2,m_1} & \cdots & s_{i_2,m_6} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_3,m_1-1} & \cdots & s_{i_3,m_6-1} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_4,m_1-1} & \cdots & s_{i_4,m_6-1} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_5,m_1-2} & \cdots & s_{i_5,m_6-2} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_6,m_1-2} & \cdots & s_{i_6,m_6-2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & s_{i_3,n_1} & s_{i_3,n_2} \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & s_{i_4,n_1} & s_{i_4,n_2} \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} s_{i_1,m_1} & \cdots & s_{i_1,m_6} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_2,m_1} & \cdots & s_{i_2,m_6} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_3,m_1-1} & \cdots & s_{i_3,m_6-1} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_4,m_1-1} & \cdots & s_{i_4,m_6-1} & 0 & 0 \\ s_{i_5,m_1-2} & \cdots & s_{i_5,m_6-2} & s_{i_5,n_1-1} & s_{i_5,n_2-1} \\ s_{i_6,m_1-2} & \cdots & s_{i_6,m_6-2} & s_{i_6,n_1-1} & s_{i_6,n_2-1} \\ s_{i_3,m_1-1} & \cdots & s_{i_3,m_6-1} & s_{i_3,n_1} & s_{i_3,n_2} \\ s_{i_4,m_1-1} & \cdots & s_{i_4,m_6-1} & s_{i_4,n_1} & s_{i_4,n_2} \end{vmatrix} \tag{3.1}$$

Obviously R_3 is contained in the common zero locus of all the possible 8×8 determinant with the above form. The inverse is also true, because if all the 2×2 determinants at the corner vanish, then the point is in R_1, so is in R_3; otherwise, at least one of the 2×2 determinants does not vanish, which implies that all the 6×6 determinats vanish, so the point is again in R_3.

Expanding the 8×8 determinant on the right hand side of the equation (3.1) into linear combinations of product of two 4×4 determinants and comparing with the definition of φ_2, we have that $\overline{\varphi_2 \circ \pi_1^{-1}(R_3 \setminus R_2)}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2\cdot\binom{d+2}{4}-1}$ is generated by $\sum_{1\leq j_1<j_2\leq 6}(-1)^{j_1+j_2-1}$ $u_{i_1i_2,i_3i_4;m_1,\cdots,\widehat{m_{j_1}},\widehat{m_{j_2}},\cdots,m_6}u_{i_3i_4,i_5i_6;n_1,n_2,m_{j_1}-1,m_{j_2}-1}$, where $\widehat{x}$ means omitting x. It is not hard

to see that $\widetilde{R}_3$ in Γ_{φ_2} is the pull-back of $\overline{\varphi_2 \circ \pi_1^{-1}(R_3 \setminus R_2)}$ by the projection $\Gamma_{\varphi_2} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2 \cdot \binom{d+2}{4}-1}$ and it is cut out in Γ_{φ_2} by the same equations.

Now the graph of rational map $\varphi_3 : \Gamma_{\varphi_2} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^3 \cdot \binom{d+3}{6} \cdot \binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ gives the blow up of Γ_{φ_2} along $\widetilde{R}_3$, where φ_3 sends general points in Γ_{φ_2} to $[\cdots : \sum_{1 \le j_1 \le j_2 \le 6} (-1)^{j_1+j_2-1}$ $u_{i_1 i_2, i_3 i_4; m_1, \cdots, \widehat{m_{j_1}}, \widehat{m_{j_2}}, \cdots, m_6} u_{i_3 i_4, i_5 i_6; n_1, n_2, m_{j_1}-1, m_{j_2}-1} : \cdots]$. We use $u^{n_1,n_2}_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4 i_5 i_6; m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4 m_5 m_6}$ to denote the coordinates in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^3 \cdot \binom{d+3}{6} \cdot \binom{d+1}{2}-1}$, where the up indices represent for the auxiliary determinant $|M_{i_3 i_4; n_1 n_2}|$. The general point in the image of φ_3 is $[\cdots :$ $|M_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4 i_5 i_6; m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4 m_5 m_6}| \cdot |M_{i_3 i_4; n_1 n_2}| : \cdots]$, where $|M_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4 i_5 i_6; m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4 m_5 m_6}|$ is the determinant of the 6×6 submatrix consisting of (i_1+1)-th,(i_2+1)-th rows from the first block and (i_3+1)-th,(i_4+1)-th rows from the second block and (i_5+1)-th,(i_6+1)-th rows from the third block and (m_j+1)-th columns $(j = 1, \cdots, 6)$ in $A_{3(r+1)\times(d+3)}$.

For any natural number k, we have the following identity $2^{k+1} - 2(k+1) = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} 2^{j-1} \cdot 2(k-j)$. We will use this identity to construct the blow-up $\Gamma_{\varphi_{k+1}} \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\varphi_k}$. Specifically for each $2(k+1) \times 2(k+1)$ minor determinant, we can add 2^{j-1} auxiliary $2(k-j) \times 2(k-j)$ determinants to it to form a $2^{k+1} \times 2^{k+1}$ determinant, where j runs over $1, \cdots, k-1$. This process of adding auxiliary determinants can be done as follows. Suppose we have known how to add auxiliary determinants to $2k \times 2k$ minor determinants. Let $|M_{i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{2k+1} i_{2(k+1)}; m_1, m_2, \cdots, m_{2k+1}, m_{2(k+1)}}|$ be a $2(k+1) \times 2(k+1)$ determinant, and we can first add a $2(k-1) \times 2(k-1)$ determinant $|M_{i_3, i_4, \cdots, i_{2k-1}, i_{2k}; n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_{2k-3}, n_{2(k-1)}}|$ to it at the corner as following

$$
\begin{vmatrix}
s_{i_1,m_1} & \cdots & s_{i_1,m_{2(k+1)}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_2,m_1} & \cdots & s_{i_2,m_{2(k+1)}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_{2k-1},m_1-(k-1)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k-1},m_{2(k+1)}-(k-1)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_{2k},m_1-(k-1)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k},m_{2(k+1)}-(k-1)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_{2k+1},m_1-k} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k+1},m_{2(k+1)}-k} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_{2(k+1)},m_1-k} & \cdots & s_{i_{2(k+1)},m_{2(k+1)}-k} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & s_{i_3,n_1} & \cdots & s_{i_3,n_{2(k-1)}} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & s_{i_4,n_1} & \cdots & s_{i_4,n_{2(k-1)}} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & s_{i_{2k-1},n_1-(k-2)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k-1},n_{2(k-1)}-(k-2)} \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & s_{i_{2k},n_1-(k-2)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k},n_{2(k-1)}-(k-2)}
\end{vmatrix} =
$$

$$\begin{vmatrix}
s_{i_1,m_1} & \cdots & s_{i_1,m_{2(k+1)}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_2,m_1} & \cdots & s_{i_2,m_{2(k+1)}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_{2k-1},m_1-(k-1)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k-1},m_{2(k+1)}-(k-1)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_{2k},m_1-(k-1)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k},m_{2(k+1)}-(k-1)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
s_{i_{2k+1},m_1-k} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k+1},m_{2(k+1)}-k} & s_{i_{2k+1},n_1-(k-1)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k+1},n_{2(k-1)}-(k-1)} \\
s_{i_{2(k+1)},m_1-k} & \cdots & s_{i_{2(k+1)},m_{2(k+1)}-k} & s_{i_{2(k+1)},n_1-(k-1)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2(k+1)},n_{2(k-1)}-(k-1)} \\
s_{i_3,m_1-1} & \cdots & s_{i_3,m_{2(k+1)}-1} & s_{i_3,n_1} & \cdots & s_{i_3,n_{2(k-1)}} \\
s_{i_4,m_1-1} & \cdots & s_{i_4,m_{2(k+1)}-1} & s_{i_4,n_1} & \cdots & s_{i_4,n_{2(k-1)}} \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\
s_{i_{2k-1},m_1-(k-1)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k-1},m_{2(k+1)}-(k-1)} & s_{i_{2k-1},n_1-(k-2)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k-1},n_{2(k-1)}-(k-2)} \\
s_{i_{2k},m_1-(k-1)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k},m_{2(k+1)}-(k-1)} & s_{i_{2k},n_1-(k-2)} & \cdots & s_{i_{2k},n_{2(k-1)}-(k-2)}
\end{vmatrix}$$

Expanding the above determinant from first $2k$ rows, we have that it is a linear combination of product of two $2k \times 2k$ determinants with the desired form. By our assumption, we know how to add auxiliary determinants to such determinants. Thus, the above expansion exactly tells us how to add the lower rank auxiliary determinants to a $2(k+1) \times 2(k+1)$ determinant. So adding auxiliary determinants with the desired form to a $2(k+1) \times 2(k+1)$ determinant can be done. The rational map $\varphi_{k+1} : \Gamma_{\varphi_k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^{k+1}\cdot\binom{d+(k+1)}{2(k+1)}\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\binom{d+(k-j)}{2(k-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ sends general points in Γ_{φ_k} into $[\cdots : \sum_{1\le j_1<j_2\le 2(k+1)} (-1)^{j_1+j_2-1} u^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};m_1,\cdots,\widehat{m_{j_1}},\widehat{m_{j_2}},\cdots,m_{2(k+1)}} u^{\tilde{J}_k}_{i_3,\cdots,i_{2(k+1)};n_1,\cdots,n_{2(k-1)},m_{j_1}-1,m_{j_2}-1} : \cdots]$, where J_k and $\tilde{J}_k$ are indices representing the auxiliary determinants added to $2k \times 2k$ determinants. The coordinate of the general point in the image of φ_{k+1} is given by the product of $|M_{i_1 i_2,\cdots,i_{2k+1}i_{2(k+1)};m_1,m_2,\cdots,m_{2k+1}m_{2(k+1)}}|$ and those auxiliary determinants added to it. We use $u^{n_1,\cdots,n_{2(k-1)},J_k,\tilde{J}_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2(k+1)};m_1,\cdots,m_{2(k+1)}} = u^{J_{k+1}}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2(k+1)};m_1,\cdots,m_{2(k+1)}}$ as the coordinates in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^{k+1}\cdot\binom{d+(k+1)}{2(k+1)}\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\binom{d+(k-j)}{2(k-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$.

Now let us continue our proof that the iterated blow-up can be carried out.

We have showed that $\widetilde{R}_2$ is smooth, so the second step in the iterated blow-ups can be done. Suppose that the iterated blow-ups can be carried out in the first k ($k \ge 2$) steps. If $k = d$, we are done. If $k < d$, let us show that we can proceed to the $(k+1)$-th step. Since Γ_{φ_k} is smooth, in order to carry out the $(k+1)$-th blow up, we only need to show that the proper transformation $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$ of R_{k+1} in Γ_{φ_k} is smooth. We use the same idea as we did before in showing the smoothness of $\widetilde{R}_2$. We construct a birational morphism $\Phi_{k+1} : \mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k} \longrightarrow R_{k+1} \subset \mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ with $\Phi([\mu_{0,0} : \cdots : \mu_{0,k} : \mu_{1,0} : \cdots : \mu_{1,k} : \cdots : \mu_{r,0} : \cdots : \mu_{r,k}]; [\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-k}]) = [\mu_{0,0}\nu_0 : \mu_{0,0}\nu_1 + \mu_{0,1}\nu_0 : \cdots : \sum_{p+q=s} \mu_{0,p}\nu_q :$

$\cdots : \mu_{0,k-1}\nu_{d-k} + \mu_{0,k}\nu_{d-k-1} : \mu_{0,k}\nu_{d-k} : \cdots : \mu_{r,0}\nu_0 : \mu_{r,0}\nu_1 + \mu_{r,1}\nu_0 : \cdots : \sum_{p+q=s}\mu_{r,p}\nu_q : \cdots : \mu_{r,k-1}\nu_{d-k} + \mu_{r,k}\nu_{d-k-1} : \mu_{0,k}\nu_{d-k}]$. The space $\mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1}$ parametrizes $(r+1)$-tuples $(g_0, \cdots, g_r)$ modulo homothety and the morphism Φ sends $(g_0, \cdots, g_r; f)$ to $(g_0 \cdot f, \cdots, g_r \cdot f)$, where $g_i(x,y) = \sum_{p=0}^{k}\mu_{i,p}x^{k-p}y^p (i = 0, \cdots, r)$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree k. In $\mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1}$, the set parametrizing $(g_0, \cdots, g_r)$ with at least one common root has a natural stratification $R'_1 \subset \cdots \subset R'_k$. By our inductive assumption, the iterated blow-ups can be carried out on $\mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1}$. Blow-up $\mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1}$ along R'_1 gives $\pi'_1 : \Gamma_{\varphi'_1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1}$. Continue the iterated blow-ups until we get $\pi'_k : \Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\varphi'_{k-1}}$. Since at each step we blow up a smooth variety along a smooth center, the final outcome $\Gamma_{\varphi'_k}$ is smooth. We will show that we can lift the morphism $\Phi_{k+1} : \mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k} \longrightarrow R_{k+1} \subset \mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ to a morphism $F : \Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{R}_{k+1} \subset \Gamma_{\varphi_k}$ such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k} & \xrightarrow{\quad F \quad} & \widetilde{R}_{k+1} \subset \Gamma_{\varphi_k} \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi'} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} \\ \mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k} & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{k+1}} & \mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1} \end{array}$$

is commutative, where $\pi' = \pi'_1 \circ \pi'_2 \circ \cdots \circ \pi'_k$ and $\pi = \pi_1 \circ \pi_2 \circ \cdots \circ \pi_k$, respectively. Moreover we will show that F gives an isomorphim between $\Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k}$ and $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$, therefore $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$ is smooth.

For any point P in $\Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k} \subset \mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{k+1}{2}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2\cdot\binom{k+2}{4}-1} \times \prod_{s=3}^{k} \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^s\cdot\binom{k+s}{2s}\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{k-2}\binom{k+(s-1-j)}{2(s-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k}$, let us define its image $F(P)$ in Γ_{φ_k}.

Since $\Gamma_{\varphi_k} \subset \mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2\cdot\binom{d+2}{4}-1} \times \prod_{s=3}^{k} \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^s\cdot\binom{d+s}{2s}\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{s-2}\binom{d+(s-1-j)}{2(s-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$, we will give the component of $F(P)$ in each projective space.

For convenience, let $\mu_{ij} = 0$ for $i = 0, \cdots, r, j = k+1, \cdots, d$ and $\nu_i = 0$ for $i = d-k+1, \cdots, d$. Then the component of $F(P)$ in $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ is $[\sum_{p+q=0}\mu_{0,p}\nu_q : \sum_{p+q=1}\mu_{0,p}\nu_q : \cdots : \sum_{p+q=d}\mu_{0,p}\nu_q : \cdots : \sum_{p+q=0}\mu_{r,p}\nu_q : \sum_{p+q=1}\mu_{r,p}\nu_q : \cdots : \sum_{p+q=d}\mu_{r,p}\nu_q]$, which is exactly Φ_{k+1} when we restrict F to $\mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k}$.

The component of $F(P)$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ is given as follows.

The component in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{d+1}{2}-1}$ of the coordinate of a general point in Γ_{φ_1} is $[\cdots : u_{i_1i_2,m_1m_2} : \cdots] = [\cdots : |M_{i_1i_2,m_1m_2}| : \cdots] = [\cdots : \left|\begin{smallmatrix} s_{i_1,m_1} & s_{i_1,m_2} \\ s_{i_2,m_1} & s_{i_2,m_2} \end{smallmatrix}\right| : \cdots] = [\cdots : \left|\begin{smallmatrix} \sum_{p_1+q_1=m_1}\mu_{i_1,p_1}\nu_{q_1} & \sum_{p_2+q_2=m_2}\mu_{i_1,p_2}\nu_{q_2} \\ \sum_{p_1+q_1=m_1}\mu_{i_2,p_1}\nu_{q_1} & \sum_{p_2+q_2=m_2}\mu_{i_2,p_2}\nu_{q_2} \end{smallmatrix}\right| : \cdots] = [\cdots : \sum_{p_1+q_1=m_1}\sum_{p_2+q_2=m_2}\nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\left|\begin{smallmatrix} \mu_{i_1,p_1} & \mu_{i_1,p_2} \\ \mu_{i_2,p_1} & \mu_{i_2,p_2} \end{smallmatrix}\right| :$

$\cdots] = [\cdots : \sum_{p_1+q_1=m_1 p_2+q_2=m_2} \sum \nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\tau_{i_1 i_2,p_1 p_2} : \cdots]$, so we take the coordinate of $F(P)$ at the position $u_{i_1 i_2,m_1 m_2}$ as $\sum_{p_1+q_1=m_1 p_2+q_2=m_2} \sum \nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\tau_{i_1 i_2,p_1 p_2}$, where $\tau_{i_1 i_2,p_1 p_2}$ are coordinates in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}\cdot\binom{k+1}{2}-1}$. We need to verify that at least one of $\sum_{p_1+q_1=m_1 p_2+q_2=m_2} \sum \nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}$ $\tau_{i_1 i_2,p_1 p_2} \neq 0$, this can be done easily. For example, there exist i_1 and i_2 such that $\tau_{i_1 i_2,p_1 p_2} \neq 0$ for some $p_1 < p_2$. Fix i_1 and i_2 and take lexicographical order among all letters $p_1 p_2 (p_1 < p_2)$, let $\tau_{i_1 i_2,p_1^\circ p_2^\circ}$ be the last nonzero element. Let ν_q be the last nonzero element among $\nu_0, \cdots, \nu_{d-k}$. Then let $q + p_1^\circ = m_1, q + p_2^\circ = m_2$, we have $\sum_{p_1+q_1=m_1 p_2+q_2=m_2} \sum \nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\tau_{i_1 i_2,p_1 p_2} = \nu_q^2 \tau_{i_1 i_2,p_1^\circ p_2^\circ} \neq 0$.

The component in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2\cdot\binom{d+2}{4}-1}$ of the coordinate of a general point in Γ_{φ_2} is $[\cdots : u_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4;m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4} : \cdots] = [\cdots : |M_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4;m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4}| : \cdots]$, where

$$|M_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4;m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4}| = \begin{vmatrix} s_{i_1,m_1} & s_{i_1,m_2} & s_{i_1,m_3} & s_{i_1,m_4} \\ s_{i_2,m_1} & s_{i_2,m_2} & s_{i_2,m_3} & s_{i_2,m_4} \\ s_{i_3,m_1-1} & s_{i_3,m_2-1} & s_{i_3,m_3-1} & s_{i_3,m_4-1} \\ s_{i_4,m_1-1} & s_{i_4,m_2-1} & s_{i_4,m_3-1} & s_{i_4,m_4-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

Since $[\cdots : s_{i,m} : \cdots] = [\cdots : \sum_{q=0}^{m} \mu_{i,m-q}\nu_q : \cdots]$, then $[\cdots : |M_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4;m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4}| : \cdots] = [$

$$\cdots : \begin{vmatrix} \sum_{q_1=0}^{m_1} \mu_{i_1,m_1-q_1}\nu_{q_1} & \sum_{q_2=0}^{m_2} \mu_{i_1,m_2-q_2}\nu_{q_2} & \sum_{q_3=0}^{m_3} \mu_{i_1,m_3-q_3}\nu_{q_3} & \sum_{q_4=0}^{m_4} \mu_{i_1,m_4-q_4}\nu_{q_4} \\ \sum_{q_1=0}^{m_1} \mu_{i_2,m_1-q_1}\nu_{q_1} & \sum_{q_2=0}^{m_2} \mu_{i_2,m_2-q_2}\nu_{q_2} & \sum_{q_3=0}^{m_3} \mu_{i_2,m_3-q_3}\nu_{q_3} & \sum_{q_4=0}^{m_4} \mu_{i_2,m_4-q_4}\nu_{q_4} \\ \sum_{q_1=0}^{m_1-1} \mu_{i_3,m_1-1-q_1}\nu_{q_1} & \sum_{q_2=0}^{m_2-1} \mu_{i_3,m_2-1-q_2}\nu_{q_2} & \sum_{q_3=0}^{m_3-1} \mu_{i_3,m_3-1-q_3}\nu_{q_3} & \sum_{q_4=0}^{m_4-1} \mu_{i_3,m_4-1-q_4}\nu_{q_4} \\ \sum_{q_1=0}^{m_1-1} \mu_{i_4,m_1-1-q_1}\nu_{q_1} & \sum_{q_2=0}^{m_2-1} \mu_{i_4,m_2-1-q_2}\nu_{q_2} & \sum_{q_3=0}^{m_3-1} \mu_{i_4,m_3-1-q_3}\nu_{q_3} & \sum_{q_4=0}^{m_4-1} \mu_{i_4,m_4-1-q_4}\nu_{q_4} \end{vmatrix} : \cdots]$$

$$= [\cdots : \sum_{q_1=0}^{m_1}\sum_{q_2=0}^{m_2}\sum_{q_3=0}^{m_3}\sum_{q_4=0}^{m_4} \nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\nu_{q_3}\nu_{q_4} \begin{vmatrix} \mu_{i_1,m_1-q_1} & \mu_{i_1,m_2-q_2} & \mu_{i_1,m_3-q_3} & \mu_{i_1,m_4-q_4} \\ \mu_{i_2,m_1-q_1} & \mu_{i_2,m_2-q_2} & \mu_{i_2,m_3-q_3} & \mu_{i_2,m_4-q_4} \\ \mu_{i_3,m_1-1-q_1} & \mu_{i_3,m_2-1-q_2} & \mu_{i_3,m_3-1-q_3} & \mu_{i_3,m_4-1-q_4} \\ \mu_{i_4,m_1-1-q_1} & \mu_{i_4,m_2-1-q_2} & \mu_{i_4,m_3-1-q_3} & \mu_{i_4,m_4-1-q_4} \end{vmatrix} : \cdots$$

$] = [\cdots : \sum_{q_1=0}^{m_1}\sum_{q_2=0}^{m_2}\sum_{q_3=0}^{m_3}\sum_{q_4=0}^{m_4} \nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\nu_{q_3}\nu_{q_4}\tau_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4;m_1-q_1,m_2-q_2,m_3-q_3,m_4-q_4} : \cdots]$. In the above computation we use the property that any determinant vanishes if it contains two repeated columns, and we also use $\tau_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4;m_1-q_1,m_2-q_2,m_3-q_3,m_4-q_4} = 0$ if any two of $m_i - q_i, i = 1,2,3,4$ are equal. So we will take the coordinate of $F(P)$ at the position $u_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4;m_1 m_2 m_3 m_4}$ as $\sum_{q_1=0}^{m_1}\sum_{q_2=0}^{m_2}\sum_{q_3=0}^{m_3}\sum_{q_4=0}^{m_4} \nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\nu_{q_3}\nu_{q_4}\ \tau_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4;m_1-q_1,m_2-q_2,m_3-q_3,m_4-q_4}$. Use the same method as in

showing at least one of $\sum\limits_{p_1+q_1=m_1}\sum\limits_{p_2+q_2=m_2}\nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\tau_{i_1i_2,p_1p_2}\neq 0$, we can prove that at least one of $\sum\limits_{q_1=0}^{m_1}\sum\limits_{q_2=0}^{m_2}\sum\limits_{q_3=0}^{m_3}\sum\limits_{q_4=0}^{m_4}\nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\nu_{q_3}\nu_{q_4}\ \tau_{i_1i_2i_3i_4;m_1-q_1,m_2-q_2,m_3-q_3,m_4-q_4}\neq 0$ as well.

Now let us specify the component of $F(P)$ in each $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^s\cdot\binom{k+s}{2s}\cdot\prod\limits_{j=1}^{k-2}\binom{k+(s-1-j)}{2(s-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ for $s=3,\cdots,k$.

Over the general point of the image $\varphi_s:\Gamma_{\varphi_{s-1}}\dashrightarrow\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^s\cdot\binom{k+s}{2s}\cdot\prod\limits_{j=1}^{k-2}\binom{k+(s-1-j)}{2(s-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$, the coordinate $[\cdots:u^{J_s}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}:\cdots]=[\cdots:\prod\limits_{|M|}|M|:\cdots]$, where $|M|$ runs over $|M_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}|$ and those auxiliary determinants added to $|M_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}|$ with indices in J_s. Experienced reader may have seen that $[\cdots:\prod\limits_{|M|}|M|:\cdots]=[\cdots:\sum\limits_{q_i}^{(2s)}\sum\limits_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^s-2s)}\prod\nu_{q_i}\cdot\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2s}-q_{2s}}:\cdots]$, where $\sum\limits_{q_i}^{(2s)}=\sum\limits_{q_1=0}^{m_1}\cdots\sum\limits_{q_{2s}=0}^{m_{2s}}$ and $\sum\limits_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^s-2s)}$ represents 2^s-2s sums over all $0\leq\tilde{q}_j\leq n_j$, n_j appearing in J_s as the column index n_j+1 in $A_{(r+1)p\times(d+p)}$ for the added auxiliary $2p\times 2p$ $(1\leq p\leq s-2)$ minor determinants. So $\prod\nu_{q_i}\cdot\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}$ is a monomial in $\nu_0,\cdots,\nu_{d-k}$ of degree 2^s.

We can order the indices in $u^{J_s}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}$ as follows.

Indices $i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}$ appear in the first position. The group of the column indices of the added $2(s-2)\times 2(s-2)$ determinant appear in the second position. The two groups of the column indices of the two added $2(s-3)\times 2(s-3)$ determinants should be put in the third position but we have to decide which group is put first, and this can be done by comparing their row indices. In general, the groups of the column indices of the 2^{j-1} added $2(s-1-j)\times 2(s-1-j)$ determinants appear in the $(j+1)$-th position. The priority among the group of indices in the $(j+1)$-th position is given by their row indices appeared in each $2(s-1-j)\times 2(s-1-j)$ determinant. Now we can arrange $u^{J_s}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^s\cdot\binom{d+s}{2s}\cdot\prod\limits_{j=1}^{d-2}\binom{d+(s-1-j)}{2(s-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ in the lexicographical order. Essentially as we did before, we can show that at least one of $\sum\limits_{q_i}^{(2s)}\sum\limits_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^s-2s)}\prod\nu_{q_i}\cdot\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2s}-q_{2s}}\neq 0$ for some $i_1,\cdots,i_{2s}$, $m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}$ and J_s. We leave this as an exercise to the interest readers.

From above we see that $F:\Gamma_{\varphi'_k}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-k}\longrightarrow\Gamma_{\varphi_k}$ is a morphism. We will show that it is in fact an isomorphism from $\Gamma_{\varphi'_k}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-k}$ onto $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$.

First let us show that F is injective.

Suppose that $F(P)=F(\bar{P})$, we show that $P=\bar{P}$.

From the definition of F, we see that $[\cdots:\sum\limits_{q_i}^{(2k)}\sum\limits_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{q_i}\cdot\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}$ $\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2k}-q_{2k}}:\cdots]=[\cdots:\sum\limits_{q_i}^{(2k)}\sum\limits_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{q_i}\cdot\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2k}-q_{2k}}$ $:\cdots]$, where $\bar{\nu}$ and $\bar{\tau}$ represent the coordinates appearing in $\bar{P}$. By the construction of $\Gamma_{\varphi'_k}$, the indices $\{m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2k}-q_{2k}\}$ of $\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2k}-q_{2k}}$ and $\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2k}-q_{2k}}$

in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k\cdot\binom{k+k}{2k}\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{k-2}\binom{k+(k-1-j)}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}=\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{k-2}\binom{2k-1-j}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ have only one choice, that is, $\{m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2k}-q_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}$. We will show that $[\cdots:\tau^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}:\cdots]=[\cdots:\bar{\tau}^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}:\cdots]$ and $[\nu_0:\cdots:\nu_{d-k}]=[\bar{\nu}_0:\cdots:\bar{\nu}_{d-k}]$.

For each fixed $\{m_1,\cdots,m_{2k}\}$ with $0\le m_1<m_2<\cdots<m_{2k}\le d+k-1$, we have $\sum_{q_i}^{(2k)}\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{q_i}\cdot\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2k}-q_{2k}}=\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}\cdot\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}}=(\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i})\cdot(\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1})$, where the sign $\pm$ depends on the permutation $l_1\cdots l_{2k}$ even or odd.

Now let us show that the linear combinations of $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}$ for $0\le m_1<m_2<\cdots<m_{2k}\le d+k-1$ produce all the monomials of degree $2k$ in $\nu_0,\cdots,\nu_{d-k}$.

Take $m_i=i-1, i=1,\cdots,2k$, then $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}=\nu_0^{2k}$. Take $m_i=i-1, i=1,\cdots,2k-1$ and $m_{2k}=2k-1+j$ for $1\le j\le d-k$, then $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}=\nu_0^{2k-1}\nu_j$. Take $m_i=i-1, i=1,\cdots,2k-2$ and $m_{2k-1}=2k-1, m_{2k}=2k$, then $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}=\nu_0^{2k-2}\nu_1^2-\nu_0^{2k-1}\nu_2$. Since $\nu_0^{2k-1}\nu_2$ is a linear combination of $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}$, so is $\nu_0^{2k-2}\nu_1^2$. Take $m_i=i-1, i=1,\cdots,2k-2$ and $m_{2k-1}=2k-1, m_{2k}=2k-1+j$ for $2\le j\le d-k$, then $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}=\nu_0^{2k-2}\nu_1\nu_j-\nu_0^{2k-1}\nu_{j+1}$. Since $\nu_0^{2k-1}\nu_{j+1}$ is a linear combination of $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}$, so is $\nu_0^{2k-2}\nu_1\nu_j$.

In general we can arrange all the monomials $\nu_0^{i_0}\cdot\cdots\cdot\nu_{d-k}^{i_{d-k}}$ in the lexicographical order, where $i_0+\cdots+i_{d-k}=2k$. Suppose that all the monomials in front of $\nu_0^{i_0}\cdot\cdots\cdot\nu_{d-k}^{i_{d-k}}$ are linear combination of $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}$. Let the ordered tuple $(m_1,\cdots,m_{2k})=(0,\cdots,i_0-1;i_0+1,\cdots,i_0+i_1;\cdots,i_0+i_1+\cdots+i_t+t+1,\cdots,i_0+i_1+\cdots+i_t+i_{t+1}+t;\cdots,i_0+i_1+\cdots+i_{d-k-1}+d-k,\cdots,i_0+i_1+\cdots+i_{d-k-1}+i_{d-k}+d-k-1)$. Note that some piece $i_0+i_1+\cdots+i_t+t+1,\cdots,i_0+i_1+\cdots+i_t+i_{t+1}+t$ may not actually appear in $(m_1,\cdots,m_{2k})$ if $i_{t+1}=0$, so m_{2k} may be smaller than $i_0+i_1+\cdots+i_{d-k-1}+i_{d-k}+d-k-1=2k+d-k-1=d+k-1$. It is easy to see that $0\le m_1<m_2<\cdots<m_{2k}\le d+k-1$. For such a $(m_1,\cdots,m_{2k})$, we have that $\nu_0^{i_0}\cdot\cdots\cdot\nu_{d-k}^{i_{d-k}}+\sum'_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}=0$, where $\sum'$ means that the sum is over all $\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}$ with at least one of $l_i\ne i-1$. Pick any monomial in $\sum'$ and let l_t be the first one in $(l_1,\cdots,l_{2k})$ with the property $l_t\ne t-1$, then $l_t>t-1$. Thus $m_t-l_t<m_t-(t-1)$. So a smaller factor $\nu_{m_t-l_t}$ appears in the monomial, which implies that this monomial is in front of $\nu_0^{i_0}\cdot\cdots\cdot\nu_{d-k}^{i_{d-k}}$. By our inductive assumption, the monomials in $\sum'$ are linear combinations of $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}}\pm\prod\nu_{m_i-l_i}$, so is $\nu_0^{i_0}\cdot\cdots\cdot\nu_{d-k}^{i_{d-k}}$.

Now from $[\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm\prod \nu_{m_i-l_i})\cdot(\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots] = [\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \bar{\nu}_{m_i-l_i}) \cdot (\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots]$, we have that $[\cdots : \sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm\prod \nu_{m_i-l_i} : \cdots] = [\cdots : \sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm\prod \bar{\nu}_{m_i-l_i} : \cdots]$. Since all the monomials of degree $2k$ are linear combinations of $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm\prod \nu_{m_i-l_i}$, the previous equation implies that $[\cdots : \nu_0^{i_0}\cdot\cdots\cdot\nu_{d-k}^{i_{d-k}} : \cdots] = [\cdots : \bar{\nu}_0^{i_0}\cdot\cdots\cdot\bar{\nu}_{d-k}^{i_{d-k}} : \cdots]$, which is exactly the $2k$-uple embedding of $\mathbb{P}^{d-k}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+k}{2k}-1}$, so $[\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-k}] = [\bar{\nu}_0 : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_{d-k}]$.

Arrange $\tau^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ in the lexicographical order. Let $\tau^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1}$ be the last non-zero element in the coordinate of P among all $\tau^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. Let ν_q be the last non-zero element in the coordinate of P among $\nu_0,\cdots,\nu_{d-k}$. Let $n_j = n_j^\circ + q$. Then $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1} = \nu_q^{2^k-2k}\tau^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1} \neq 0$. From $[\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \nu_{m_i-l_i}) \cdot (\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots] = [\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \bar{\nu}_{m_i-l_i}) \cdot (\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots]$, we have that $[\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \nu_{m_i-l_i}) \cdot (\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots] = [\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \bar{\nu}_{m_i-l_i}) \cdot (\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots]$, so $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}$ $\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1} \neq 0$. Since $[\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-k}] = [\bar{\nu}_0 : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_{d-k}]$, we have that $\bar{\nu}_q$ is the last non-zero element in the coordinate of $\bar{P}$ among $\bar{\nu}_0,\cdots,\bar{\nu}_{d-k}$. It follows from $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\ \bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1} \neq 0$ that the last non-zero element in the coordinate of $\bar{P}$ among all $\bar{\tau}^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ is equal to or strictly behind $\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1}$. From the construction and the symmetric role of ν_q and $\bar{\nu}_q$, we see that the last non-zero element in the coordinate of $\bar{P}$ among all $\bar{\tau}^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ is $\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1}$. So $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1}$ $= \bar{\nu}_q^{2^k-2k}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1} \neq 0$. From $[\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \nu_{m_i-l_i}) \cdot (\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j}$ $\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots] = [\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \bar{\nu}_{m_i-l_i}) \cdot (\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}$ $\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots]$, we have $[\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} : \nu_q^{2^k-2k}\tau^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1}]$ $= [\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} : \bar{\nu}_q^{2^k-2k}\ \bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1}]$. We will use this relation and $[\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-k}] = [\bar{\nu}_0 : \cdots : \bar{\nu}_{d-k}]$ to show that $[\cdots : \tau^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} : \cdots] = [\cdots : \bar{\tau}^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} : \cdots]$. For simplicity, let $\nu_q = \bar{\nu}_q = \tau^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1} = \bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j^\circ,\cdots}_{i_1^\circ,\cdots,i_{2k}^\circ;0,\cdots,2k-1} = 1$. Then $\nu_i = \bar{\nu}_i (i = 0,\cdots,d-k)$ and $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} = \sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}$

$\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. Now let us show that $\tau^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\tau}^{J_k}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$.

Let $\tau^{J'_k}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ and $\bar{\tau}^{J'_k}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ be the coordinate component of P and $\bar{P}$ immediately in front of $\tau^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ and $\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{k-2}\binom{2k-1-j}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$, respectively. If $(i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k})<(i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k})$, then $J'_k=(\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots)$. Pick $n_j=q+n^\circ_j$. Then $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\nu_q^{2^k-2k}\tau^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\tau^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ because any $\tilde{q}_j<q$ will give an element between $\tau^{J'_k}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ and $\tau^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$, which is impossible due to the choice of $\tau^{J'_k}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. Similarly for $n_j=q+n^\circ_j$, we have $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\nu}_q^{2^k-2k}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. Now $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ gives $\tau^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. If $(i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k})=(i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k})$, then $J'_k=(\cdots,n'_j,\cdots)<(\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots)$. Pick $n_j=n'_j+q$. Then $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\nu_q^{2^k-2k}\tau^{\cdots,n'_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}+\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$, where $\sum'$ means that the sum is over all $\tilde{q}_j$ with at least one less than q. Each term $\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ in $\sum'$ is behind $\tau^{\cdots,n'_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$, so it is either $\tau^{\cdots,n^\circ_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ or zero and it agrees with $\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$, thus $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. Hence $\tau^{\cdots,n'_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\nu_q^{2^k-2k}\tau^{\cdots,n'_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}-\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}-\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\nu}_q^{2^k-2k}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n'_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n'_j,\cdots}_{i^\circ_1,\cdots,i^\circ_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. Therefore in either case we have $\tau^{J'_k}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\tau}^{J'_k}_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$.

Suppose that the correspondening coordinate components of P and $\bar{P}$ behind $\tau^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ and $\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k\cdot\prod_{j=1}^{k-2}\binom{2k-1-j}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ agree, we will show that $\tau^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ as well.

Replacing n_j with n_j+q in the formula $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$, we have that $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j+q-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\nu_q^{2^k-2k}\tau^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ $+\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j+q-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j+q-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}=\bar{\nu}_q^{2^k-2k}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ $+\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)}\prod\bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j}\bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j+q-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$, where $\sum'$ again represents the summation over all the $\tilde{q}_j$

with at least one less than q. By our inductive assumption, $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j} \tau^{\cdots,n_j+q-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ $= \sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \bar{\nu}_{\tilde{q}_j} \bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j+q-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. So the previous equation implies that $\tau^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ $= \nu_q^{2^k-2k} \tau^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} = \bar{\nu}_q^{2^k-2k} \bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} = \bar{\tau}^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$. This completes the proof that the coordinate components of P and $\bar{P}$ agree in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{2k-1-j}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$.

Essentially in the same way we can show that the coordinate components of P and $\bar{P}$ agree in $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^s \cdot \binom{k+s}{2s} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{k+(s-1-j)}{2(s-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ for $s = 3, \cdots, k-1$, $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2} \cdot \binom{k+1}{2}-1}$, $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2} \cdot \binom{k+1}{2}-1}$, and $\mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^2 \cdot \binom{k+2}{4}-1}$, respectively. We leave it as an exercise to the interest readers. From the definition of $\Phi_{k+1} : \mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k} \longrightarrow R_{k+1} \subset \mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(r+1)-1}$ and $\nu_i = \bar{\nu}_i (i = 0, \cdots, d-k)$, it is easy to see that the coordinate components of P and $\bar{P}$ in $\mathbb{P}^{(k+1)(r+1)-1}$ agree as well. This completes the proof that F is injective.

Since F is an injective morphism between projective varieties, it is finite and hence closed. That $\pi^{-1}(R_{k+1} \setminus R_k) \subset F(\Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k})$ and F closed implies $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$, the closure of $\pi^{-1}(R_{k+1} \setminus R_k)$ in Γ_{φ_k}, is a subset of $F(\Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k})$, so F is onto.

Now we have proved that $F : \Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k} \longrightarrow \widetilde{R}_{k+1}$ is a bijection. In order to show that F is actually an isomorphism, it is enough to show that F is a closed immersion.

By a local criterion on closed immersion (see, for example, Proposition 7.3, Chapter II in Hartshorne [3]), we need to verify that the coordinate functions in F separate points and tangent vectors. That the coordinate functions in F separate points has been shown above. Now let us show that they also separate tangent vectors.

Since F is a homeomorphism onto $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$, to show that the coordinate functions in F separate tangent vectors, we only need to show that the morphsim of sheaves $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{R}_{k+1}} \longrightarrow F_* \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\varphi'_k} \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k}}$ is surjective. We check this surjectivity on stalks.

From the proof of injectivity, we see that F restricted to $\mathbb{P}^{d-k} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{2k-1-j}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ gives a morphism $G : \mathbb{P}^{d-k} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{2k-1-j}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k \cdot \binom{d+k}{2k} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{d+(k-1-j)}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$, where $G([\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-k}]; [\cdots : \tau^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} : \cdots]) = [\cdots : (\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \nu_{m_i-l_i}) \cdot (\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j} \tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}) : \cdots]$. Let $\tilde{G} : \mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+k}{2k}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{d+(k-1-j)}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k \cdot \binom{d+k}{2k} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{d+(k-1-j)}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ be the standard Serge embedding. Then G can be decomposed as $\tilde{G} \circ H$, where $H : \mathbb{P}^{d-k} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{2k-1-j}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+k}{2k}-1} \times \mathbb{P}^{\binom{r+1}{2}^k \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k-2} \binom{2k-1-j}{2(k-1-j)}^{2^{j-1}}-1}$ is the morphism sending $[\nu_0 : \cdots : \nu_{d-k}]; [\cdots : \tau^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} : \cdots]$ into $[\cdots : \sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm \prod \nu_{m_i-l_i} : \cdots]; [\cdots : \sum_{\tilde{q}_j}{}'^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j} \tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1} : \cdots]$. Since $\tilde{G}$ is an embedding when restricted to the image of H,

then $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm\prod \nu_{m_i-l_i}$ and $\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^k-2k)} \prod \nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};0,\cdots,2k-1}$ are locally regular functions in terms of $u^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};m_1,\cdots,m_{2k}}$. We have showed that all the monomials of degree $2k$ in $\nu_0,\cdots,\nu_{d-k}$ are linear combination of $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm\prod \nu_{m_i-l_i}$. So locally $\nu_0,\cdots,\nu_{d-k}$ are regular functions of $\sum_{\{l_1,\cdots,l_{2k}\}=\{0,\cdots,2k-1\}} \pm\prod \nu_{m_i-l_i}$. Therefore $\nu_0,\cdots,\nu_{d-k}$ are locally regular functions in terms of $u^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};m_1,\cdots,m_{2k}}$.

Given any point Q in $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$, let $F^{-1}(Q)=P$. We need to show that $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{R}_{k+1},Q}\longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\varphi'_k}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-k},P}$ is surjective.

Pick affine neighborhoods around P and Q. For convenience we still use the same letters to represent coordinates but the reader should be aware of that they are affine now. Consider the following linear equations in unknown variables $\mu_{i,j},\tau_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2}$, $\tau_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4}$ and $\tau^{J_s}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}, s=3,\cdots,k$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{p+q=j}\nu_q\mu_{ip} &= s_{ij}\\
\sum_{p_1+q_1=m_1}\sum_{p_2+q_2=m_2}\nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\tau_{i_1i_2,p_1p_2} &= u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2}\\
\sum_{q_1=0}^{m_1}\sum_{q_2=0}^{m_2}\sum_{q_3=0}^{m_3}\sum_{q_4=0}^{m_4}\nu_{q_1}\nu_{q_2}\nu_{q_3}\nu_{q_4}\tau_{i_1i_2i_3i_4;m_1-q_1,m_2-q_2,m_3-q_3,m_4-q_4} &= u_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4}\\
\sum_{q_i}^{(2s)}\sum_{\tilde{q}_j}^{(2^s-2s)}\prod\nu_{q_i}\cdot\prod\nu_{\tilde{q}_j}\tau^{\cdots,n_j-\tilde{q}_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1-q_1,\cdots,m_{2s}-q_{2s}} &= u^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}\\
s=3,\cdots,k&
\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

By the injectivity of F, for part of the coordinates $\nu_0,\cdots,\nu_{d-k}$ in P and the coordinates $s_{ij},u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2},u_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4},u^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}, s=3,\cdots,k$ in Q, the above linear equations have a unique solution, which implies that the coefficient matrix is of full column rank and $\mu_{i,j},\tau_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2}$, $\tau_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4}$ and $\tau^{J_s}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}, s=3,\cdots,k$ are given by quotient of determinants involving $\nu_i, i=0,\cdots,d-k$ and $s_{ij},u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2},u_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4}$, $u^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}, s=3,\cdots,k$. Since full column rank is an open condition, by shrinking the affine neighborhood of P if necessary, we can assume that the coefficient matrix is of full column rank everywhere in the neighborhood. Hence $\mu_{i,j},\tau_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2},\tau_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4}$ and $\tau^{J_s}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}, s=3,\cdots,k$ can be given by quotient of determinants involving variables $\nu_i, i=0,\cdots,d-k$, $s_{ij},u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2}$, $u_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4}$, and $u^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}, s=3,\cdots,k$ locally. We have known that locally $\nu_i, i=0,\cdots,d-k$ are regular functions in terms of $u^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2k};m_1,\cdots,m_{2k}}$, so locally $\mu_{i,j},\tau_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2},\tau_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4}$ and $\tau^{J_s}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}$, $s=3,\cdots,k$ are regular functions in terms of $s_{ij},u_{i_1,i_2;m_1,m_2},u_{i_1,\cdots,i_4;m_1,\cdots,m_4}$, and $u^{\cdots,n_j,\cdots}_{i_1,\cdots,i_{2s};m_1,\cdots,m_{2s}}$, $s=3,\cdots,k$. This completes the proof that $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{R}_{k+1}}\longrightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_{\varphi'_k}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-k}}$ is surjective. So F is an immersion.

Since $F:\Gamma_{\varphi'_k}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-k}\longrightarrow\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$ is a bijection and immersion, it is an isomorphism. The smoothness of $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$ follows from that of $\Gamma_{\varphi'_k}\times\mathbb{P}^{d-k}$. Therefore the $(k+1)$-th blow-up can

be carried out. This completes the proof that the iterated blow-ups along the strata (or its proper transformations) of $M_d(\mathbb{P}^r) \setminus M_d^\circ(\mathbb{P}^r)$ can be done. The final outcome of the iterated process is Γ_{φ_d}, whose boundary consists of an exceptional divisor E_d and $d-1$ proper transformation of the exceptional divisors $\tilde{E}_i, i = 1, \cdots, d-1$ appearing in the first $(d-1)$ blow-ups. To complete our proof of theorem 1.1, we only need to show that the union of E_d and $\tilde{E}_i, i = 1, \cdots, d-1$ are normal crossing divisors.

For $d = 1$, we have known that the boundary consists of an exceptional divisor, which is of course normal crossing. Suppose that the iterated blow-ups can be carried out for the space of holomorphic maps of degree less than d and the final outcome has normal crossing boundary. From the proof of the smoothness of $\widetilde{R}_{k+1}$, we see that F induces an isomorphism between $(E'_k \cap \bigcup_{i\in I} \tilde{E}'_i) \times \mathbb{P}^{d-k}$ and $\widetilde{R}_{k+1} \cap (E_k \cap \bigcup_{i\in I} \tilde{E}_i)$ for any subset I of $\{1, \cdots, k-1\}$. So $\widetilde{R}_{k+1} \cap (E_k \cap \bigcup_{i\in I} \tilde{E}_i)$ is smooth, which implies that $\tilde{E}_{k+1}$ and $\tilde{E}_i, i = 1, \cdots, k$ are normal crossing. Carrying out the whole iterated blow-ups will give that E_d and $\tilde{E}_i, i = 1, \cdots, d-1$ are normal crossing divisors.

References

1. W. Fulton and R. MacPherson, A compactification of configuration spaces. Ann. of Math. (2) **139** (1994), no. 1, 183–225.

2. J. Harris, Algebraic Geometry. A first course. Corrected reprint of the 1992 original. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, no. **133**. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. xx+328 pp.

3. R. Hartshorne, Algebraic Geometry. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, no. **52**. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977. xvi+496 pp.

4. Y. Hu, A compactification of open varieties. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 355 (2003), no. 12, 4737–4753.

5. K. Kakié, The resultant of several homogeneous polynomials in two indeterminates. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **54** (1976), 1–7.

6. R. MacPherson and C. Procesi, Making conical compactifications wonderful. Selecta Math. (N.S.) **4** (1998), no. **1**, 125–139.

7. A. Ulyanov, Polydiagonal compactification of configuration spaces. J. Algebraic Geom. **11** (2002), no. **1**, 129–159.

Department of Mathematics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA.
jiayuan@uga.edu